

AUG 13 1943

VOL. LXIV, 3

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICH.

WHOLE No. 255

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

Edited by

BENJAMIN D. MERITT

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, RICHARD M. HAYWOOD

KEMP MALONE, HENRY T. ROWELL

Honorary Editor

DAVID MOORE ROBINSON

JULY, 1943

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Hecataeus and Xenophanes. By †W. A. HEIDEL, - - - - -	257
The Garden of Phoebus. By JOSEPH FONTENROSE, - - - - -	278
Alexander's Deification. By C. A. ROBINSON, JR., - - - - -	286
Ammianus' Account of Gallus Caesar. By E. A. THOMPSON, - - - - -	302
The <i>Δίκη Βλάβης</i> in Demosthenes, <i>Or.</i> , LV. By HANS JULIUS WOLFF, - - - - -	316
Pindar, <i>Nemean</i> , VII, 31-35. By GILBERT NORWOOD, - - - - -	325
<i>Pageant</i> = Lat. <i>Pagina</i> . By LEO SPITZER, - - - - -	327
<i>Parlascio</i> — <i>Perilasio</i> . By LEO SPITZER, - - - - -	330
Numismatic Evidence of the Battle of Lysimachia. By F. M. HEICHELHEIM, - - - - -	332
Some Greek and Grecized Words in Renaissance Latin. By C. R. THOMPSON, - - - - -	333
REVIEWS: - - - - -	336

Kirchner's Inscriptiones Graecae: Vol. II et III, editio minor. Pars tertia, fasciculus posterior (W. KENDRICK PRITCHETT).—*Cook's* Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion. Volume III: Zeus God of the Dark Sky (Earthquake, Clouds, Wind, Dew, Rain, Meteorites) (IVAN M. LINFORTH).—*Buck's* A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus (GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH).—*The Annual of the British School at Athens*, No. XXXVII, Session 1936-37. Papers presented to Professor J. L. Myres in Honour of his 70th Birthday (OSCAR BRONNER).—*The Annual of the British School at Athens*, No. XXXVIII, Session 1937-38 (GEORGE E. MYLONAS).—*Thompson's* The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors (H. LAMAR CROSBY).—*Jeanmaire's* Couroi et Courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique (JOSEPH FONTENROSE).—*Carcopino's* Daily Life in Ancient Rome. Translated by E. O. Lorimer. Edited with Bibliography and Notes by H. T. Rowell (GEORGE DEPUÉ HADZSITS).—*Prentice's* The Ancient Greeks. Studies toward a Better Understanding of the Ancient World (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—*Campbell's* The Agamemnon of Aeschylus Translated into English Verse with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix of New Notes on the Text (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—*Macurdy's* The Quality of Mercy. The Gentler Virtues in Greek Literature (DAVID M. ROBINSON).—*Jones' The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (GLANVILLE DOWNEY).—*Duckworth's* T. Macci Plauti Epidicus. Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary, in which is included the work of the late Arthur L. Wheeler (CLINTON W. KEYES).—*Moore's* Livy, Vol. VI (Books XXIII-XXV). With an English Translation (D. O. ROBINSON).—*Sturtevant's* The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin. Second Edition (ROLAND G. KENT).—*Paton's* The Venetians in Athens 1687-1688. From the *Istoria* of Cristoforo Ivanovich (FREDERIC C. LANE).—*Kelly's* Sancti Ambrosii Liber de Consolatione Valentiniani. A Text with a Translation, Introduction and Commentary (LOUIS FURMAN SAS).—*Goodenough's* An Introduction to Philo Judaeus (ALEXANDER C. PURDY).

BOOKS RECEIVED, - - - - -	384
---------------------------	-----

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology, and especially in the field of Greek and Roman studies. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage 25 cents extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the editor, Benjamin D. Meritt; proof should be returned to the secretary, Evelyn H. Clift, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Contributors are entitled to receive twenty-five copies of their respective contributions free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost.

Subscriptions, remittances, and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.

The contents of the American Journal of Philology are indexed regularly in the International Index to Periodicals.

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. LXIV, 3

WHOLE No. 255

HECATAEUS AND XENOPHANES.

The Milesian school did not concern itself particularly with questions relating to religion. Its conception of the soul, as it appears in the record, is entirely consistent with that of the epic poems; and the same may be said of its view of the gods. If in this regard a difference is to be noted, it may be regarded as the natural result of tendencies already observable in Homer and Hesiod. The gods of mythology do not appear in the account of the world given by the Milesians, the agents being natural objects and forces. Aristophanes, toward the close of the fifth century, represents Zeus as dethroned and supplanted by Dinos and Necessity.¹ However justly this might be said of the consequences of the natural philosophy inaugurated by the Milesians as they appeared after a lapse of more than a century, there is nothing to show that Anaximander and Anaximenes were conscious of such implications of the attitude they adopted toward nature. In Homer occasionally and still oftener in Hesiod the gods are little more than personifications of nature, a fact clearly perceived and expressed already in the sixth century by Theagenes of Rhegium.² The Milesians might therefore pursue their way, interpreting nature as it seemed reasonable to them, without being conscious of breaking with the hallowed tradition, so long as they recognized that all things were full of gods. Such an attitude was the more natural to them as Ionians, because Ionia in the sixth century had gone farther in secularizing religion than had other Greek lands even a century later. Furthermore,

¹ Aristophanes, *Clouds*, 376-381, 828, 1470-71.

² Cf. Diels-Kranz, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker* (hereafter cited simply as Diels-Kranz), 8, 2 = I, pp. 51-2 (Theagenes, frag. 2).

the Milesians were chiefly concerned with external nature, its origin, processes, and periodicity, with a growing sense of order in the world and of a pervading and all-compelling necessity, in the face of which the individual counted for little. Their view of the soul as of a fleeting breath was not calculated to give it great importance, and such ethical conceptions as they applied to the operations of nature were social, having regard not to the individual but to the civil group.

The latter half of the sixth century witnessed a change, the origin and causes of which are obscure. It is probable, indeed, that we should be equally in the dark in this matter even if our sources of information about this period were a hundredfold more abundant than they actually are; for the determining influences may reasonably be assumed to have been entirely different in the several regions in which the signs of change appear. Nor does the change everywhere have the same direction and result. Orphism is especially prominent in Magna Graecia, but Orpheus was localized in Thrace, while Athens was regarded as a center of Orphic propaganda. How far Orphism penetrated Ionia is not clear, because it cannot always be distinguished from the mystic cult of Dionysus, which certainly won many adherents there. In Ionia and in colonies where Ionian refugees found asylum one can imagine a religious revival following the humiliating subjugation of Asia Minor by the Persians; but the general receptivity for the new movement cannot be so explained. Moreover, the results were entirely different in different regions and individuals. What is common to many, if not all, movements of this time is heightened interest in matters concerning religion. From another point of view one may say that man is becoming more conscious of himself and of his place in the world. If in Anaximander we find evidence of concern about the origin of man, it is still chiefly in connection with the origin of land animals in general. His conception of cosmic justice suggests an instinctive, rather than a reflective, application of a moral postulate to the world. In Xenophanes the application of ethical concepts in defining the character of God is essential and obviously conscious. Whatever God may have meant to him, it is certain that the concept he framed is essentially an ethical ideal. Xenophanes was acquainted with the anthropology of his day and knew how certain peoples, Scythians and Ethiopians,

imagined their gods,³ but it was not from a comparative study of their conceptions that he arrived at his own: he found it by examining his own mind and applying his concept of perfection. Aristotle suggests that his model was the universe—the fact that it is *one* led to the notion of the unity of God.⁴ Though Aristotle and Theophrastus may have been right in their belief that Xenophanes practically identified God with the world, one cannot accept the inference that the unity of the world suggested the unity of God;⁵ for, even if the world is conceived as a cosmos, its unity is not directly given: it is so conceived only because the moral postulate demands that it shall be a unit.

The Orphic and Dionysiac conception of the soul is essentially a primitive notion growing out of the unity of a group. In itself it has no special religious significance, having no necessary relation either to conduct or to God. The Dionysiac anthropogony, indeed, developed this primitive idea by conceiving the human soul as having a twofold origin, partly divine, partly Titanic; but, while the better part of the soul was thus derived from heaven, to which it yearns to return, it is not clear that the purifications, by which it might be freed from the Titanic taint, were other than ritual and material. Pythagoras, or at any rate early Pythagoreans, raised the purification into the ethical sphere by recognizing a just and philanthropic life as a means to this end. The Dionysiac, Orphic, and Pythagorean conventicles held the belief in a periodic cycle under the power of fate or necessity. They sought means of escape from it. The Milesians, Xenophanes and Heraclitus, likewise accepted the belief in periodic cycles, as had Hesiod; for them, however, it seems to have had only a cosmic significance, unless Heraclitus actually thought of the conflagration of the world as in some sense a judgment. In Hecataeus these cosmic cycles became important in connection with chronology.

A significant indication of the changed state of mind is the attitude of men at this time to Homer and Hesiod. So far as we can see, the Orphics, Dionysiacs, and Pythagoreans did not directly combat the views of these worthies.⁶ There are various

³ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 16.

⁴ Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 986 B 21-24.

⁵ Cf. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy*, p. 201, n. 228.

⁶ The *Descent to Hades*, however, depicted the punishment of Homer

assignable reasons why they should not have done so. The rites performed by these groups did not come into competition with the state religion, which everywhere was concerned chiefly with Olympian gods. The rites of the conventicles⁷ were more closely analogous to those of the clans, which by the end of the sixth century must have largely lost their original restriction to a group composed of blood-relations. As the clan worship could exist alongside the state worship, there was no good reason why these brotherhoods might not, like the "phratries," be tolerated, unless their observances by shocking excesses aroused a community. Such instances seem to have been confined to the distant past when the worship of Dionysus was introduced. Indeed, that the Orphic conventicles were established in a peaceable way without conflict is suggested not only by the almost total want of information regarding the process but also by the fact that the Orphics produced theogonies to match the Hesiodic. For them Homer and Hesiod are at best models, at worst something to be altered. As for the Pythagoreans, Homer and Hesiod and their gods appear to have had no significance for them.⁸ So far as their conduct of life is concerned, we conclude that it was directed to other ends, though Apollo was worshipped among them.

While, therefore, the sects seem to have largely ignored the Olympian gods, and to have paid slight attention to Homer and Hesiod, except as literary models, the other thinkers of this time boldly challenged the teachers of the multitude. Herodotus, almost certainly following Hecataeus of Miletus, says that Homer and Hesiod taught the Greeks the names and functions of their gods, who, ultimately derived from Egypt, were in the time of the Pelasgians without names (and presumably without differentiated functions).⁹ Hecataeus had even made merry over the Greek traditions and had represented Heracles and Dionysus as human beings deified for their services to man. Xenophanes rebuked Homer and Hesiod for their accounts of

and Hesiod in the Lower World—for what? One can understand why Heraclitus or even Xenophanes should dislike them.

⁷ Did they include sacrifices? Cf. Diels-Kranz, 1 B 5 = Plato, *Republic* 364 E-365 A on which cf. Linforth, *The Arts of Orpheus*, pp. 77-85.

⁸ But see note 6 *supra*.

⁹ Herodotus, II, 52-53.

the characters and behavior of the gods, which included everything that is a shame and a reproach among men;¹⁰ and Heraclitus also rebuked these same prophets. Perhaps the most scathing denunciation of Homer is to be found in his exclamation: "Ay, let them (the people) think that they are only holding fast what their most esteemed teacher thinks; yet, verily Justice will overtake the fabricators and sponsors of lies."¹¹ Clement of Alexandria cites this saying as confirming his belief that Heraclitus thought of the destruction of the world by fire as a fiery purification of those who have lived evil lives.

Now Heraclitus couples many of these persons together in a common denunciation: "The learning of many things teacheth not understanding, else would it have taught Hesiod and Pythagoras, and again Xenophanes and Hecataeus."¹² Why he should have singled them out is perhaps not so difficult to understand as why he should have grouped them together. They were one and all men of mark, and excepting Hesiod they were roughly contemporary, older by a generation than Heraclitus himself. Though decried for a common devotion to miscellaneous learning, it does not follow that they were alike in aims or interests. They are, in fact, instructive examples of the different ways in which men of different characters and under different circumstances react to similar influences. They were all natives of Ionia with the exception of Hesiod, and even he may have been born near by, in the little city of Cyma in Aeolis, with which legend connected Homer. At all events Hesiod's father had lived there before he emigrated to rocky Ascra in Boeotia. Despite the different themes and spirit due to changed times and environment, Hesiod's works clearly betray the influence of Homer; but his personality is not, like that of Homer, hidden behind his theme, but, like that of Archilochus, stands in the foreground. He heralds the age of strong and self-conscious individuality, to which belong all the other men whom Heraclitus, himself a man of uncompromising individuality, berated for their want of understanding. It is in fact this common trait of character that most arrests our attention and accounts for their several contributions.

¹⁰ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 11.

¹¹ Diels-Kranz, 22 B 28 (cf. *A. J. P.*, LXIII [1942], p. 120).

¹² Diels-Kranz, 22 B 40 (Burnet's translation).

We may first consider Hecataeus, though he was perhaps the youngest of the group. He was born at Miletus, probably about 560 B. C., and can be understood only as the continuator of the work of the Milesian school. Whether he was personally in touch with that illustrious group we cannot say, because we do not know whether it existed as such after the death of Anaximenes, the date of which is likewise uncertain. In any case there is nothing to suggest that he owed anything to Anaximenes. If he did, it was probably in a negative way. We hear of adherents of the philosophy of Anaximenes in the fifth century, and from the character of their work as well as from the record regarding Anaximenes himself we gather that it was concerned chiefly with cosmology. With cosmology Hecataeus apparently did not deal at all. Actually he harked back to Anaximander, taking up the problem where he had left it.

Anaximander's main interest centered in chronology and geography, though he sketched the origin and order of the world, as seems to have been the almost invariable rule with later geographers. We are told that in the book which Apollodorus of Athens found in the second century B. C. the great Milesian had given a "summary account of his opinions."¹³ This statement is generally interpreted as meaning that the book was brief and sketchy; but this inference is not justified. It was his "opinions" that were briefly stated; and we must ask on what subjects he expressed opinions that were likely to be consulted. Surely it was not his opinions regarding human history or descriptive geography; for the doxographic tradition entirely ignored these subjects, and in consequence Hecataeus, who confined himself to this field, is not even mentioned in it. If Anaximander gave only a summary sketch of cosmology and cosmography, we infer that he did so, as later geographers and historians did, because he felt that it was the logical introduction to his main theme. Anaximenes took up this subject and made it peculiarly his own, dealing with it more at length and making his contribution there. That may be the reason why Hecataeus entirely ignored the subject. He may have felt that he could not do better, or he may have been little interested in it.

At all events he chose to continue the work of Anaximander. We are told, apparently on the authority of Eratosthenes, that

¹³ Diels-Kranz, 12 A 1 (= Diogenes Laertius, II, 2).

he made a marvellous improvement in the map of his predecessor.¹⁴ Though, or perhaps just because, we have no information on the subject, we may assume that he followed the same principles. His improvement must, therefore, have consisted essentially in the extension of the chart to include more lands and in the correction of the contour of the earth. We are sure that he introduced notable changes in the east, based on the conquests of Darius and the voyage of Scylax of Caryanda; for he was regarded as an authority on the Orient down to quite late times. In particular we may be sure that he incorporated the "Persian map," which may be reconstructed from the account of Herodotus, thereby giving a better approximation to the actual map of the external lands added to the Persian Empire. In doing so he must have discarded the old notion, later revived, of a land-bridge connecting India with Libya (Africa). There is no reason to assume that he had visited these eastern lands, though his personal relations with the Persian court may have led him to penetrate Asia Minor and even Persia. He knew Egypt from personal observation, having probably accompanied Cambyses on his expedition of conquest. He was acquainted also with northern Libya. His relations with the Persian court may well have facilitated his journey to the West, since the Phoenicians also were subjects of the Great King. The fragments of his geographical treatise reveal a detailed knowledge of the West which was not again equalled for some centuries. This also suggests a connection with the Phoenicians and their colonies of Carthage and Gades, as does the relatively vague picture of the coast of the Gulf of Genoa, which the Phocæan colony of Massalia controlled. In the north the "Scythian square" seems to be due to Hecataeus. We conclude, therefore, that the "inner map," that is, the map of the Mediterranean and of the Persian Empire, as we reconstruct it from the account of Herodotus, is essentially the work of Hecataeus.

But Hecataeus was a descriptive geographer in the larger sense, not only a cartographer, but interested also in physiography. It is certain that in its essentials at least the account of the nature of Egypt given by Herodotus is based on his observations, which probably extended into the Libyan desert.

¹⁴ Jacoby, *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, Erster Teil, p. 3 = Hecataeus, Testimonia 12 a.

Other observations also, such as those relative to the Achelous and the Thessalian plain go with these, and possibly Plato's account of Attica. With this interest Hecataeus combined that of anthropology and ethnography, though it is not always clear how far he carried his researches. Points of contact between the Hippocratic treatise on *Airs, Waters, and Locations* and Herodotus and observations treated as matters of common knowledge by the poets and Sophists of the fifth century suggest the existence of a considerable body of ethnology, a good part of which may with great probability be attributed to him.

But for Hecataeus geography was intimately connected with history. One sees this most clearly in connection with Egypt. Though in the account of Herodotus it is not at once apparent, the discussion of the nature of Egypt is concerned with geological history as the condition and background of the history of civilization, because the higher culture of the world was thought to be ultimately derived from the land of the Nile. Hecataeus calculated that kings and high priests had left records there for more than eleven thousand years, and from Arrian¹⁵ we may infer that he thought a (perhaps lower) culture had existed there in even more remote times, because he recognized the Delta as due to the secular deposit of silt by the river and assumed that man had gradually descended the Nile Valley as the resulting fens became inhabitable. Thus the age of Nilotic culture was conjecturally extended from the recorded eleven thousand backward to a possible twenty thousand years. To a Greek, whose constructive chronology, based on legendary genealogies, extended over a period only one-tenth as long as that supposed to be actually recorded in Egypt, this result was astonishing and of the utmost importance. Not only did it guarantee an immense lapse of time in which almost anything might have occurred, but it offered the possibility of a definite chronological scale as the necessary basis of universal history. In order to make this scale practically serviceable, however, points of contact must be found between the chronologies of different peoples. These Hecataeus discovered in synchronisms. He had evidently begun, as was natural, with the Greek past. Here he could with reasonable assurance go back a number of generations to the

¹⁵ *Anabasis*, V, 6, 5; cf. *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XVIII, 2, p. 61.

beginning of the strictly historical age; beyond that point he must resort to legendary genealogies, and farther back lay the mythical world. Long before his time the mythical age had been divided into periods associated with divine dynasties, but there were also myths that recounted a series of catastrophic events affecting the cosmos. The notions associated with the catastrophes that periodically began and terminated a cosmic age, as we find them clearly reflected in the literature of the fifth and fourth centuries, and less clearly but yet unmistakably even in Homer, are the same as those which recur everywhere in the Orient, and bear a distinctly astrological character. The doxographic tradition ascribes the belief in cosmic periods to Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Xenophanes, and Pythagoras, though the mythical connotations are not mentioned. It was natural, then, that Hecataeus also should hold the belief in such periods. What interests us is that he brought these cycles into relation with the long period of recorded history in Egypt but discovered there no trace of the supposed cosmic catastrophes. Whether in this, as at other points, he was slyly casting doubt on the Greek tradition one cannot say. It seems plain, however, that he made, at least in his own mind, a distinction between the mythical past and what he must have accepted as at least partly historical. The synchronisms between Greek and Egyptian history he made relate to more recent times: between Sesostris and the Argonautic Expedition and "Proteus" and the Trojan era. A more general basis of comparing dates he seems to have found in the chronology of Heracles, from whom, according to Greek tradition, the royal families of various lands claimed descent.

That Hecataeus was the author of the sketch of Egyptian history, which we find in a confused form in Herodotus, I have elsewhere tried to prove.¹⁰ If that be true, he may be regarded as the Father of History in the narrower sense. But even if one disregards his claims in this particular, it must be conceded that he actually laid the indispensable foundations of universal history in his chronological scheme. Like other early writers, and many of later times, he leaned too heavily on myth and legend, thinking to extract history from them by simple ration-

¹⁰ *Memoirs of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences*, XVIII, 2, pp. 53-134.

alization, and one cannot fail to detect a certain whimsical and ironic turn in his procedure; but this does not obscure the brilliancy of his conception or the merit of his achievement. It is especially significant as a conscious effort to bring within the scope of knowledge the scattered and hitherto unconnected details of geological and human history. The method he projected and—too lightly—used remains the method of universal history, corrected and refined as knowledge and reflection have advanced. The universality of his outlook and purpose is particularly noteworthy and stamps him as a man of genius; but, even more important, it reveals the scope and spirit of the Milesian school. His achievement in the field of history is the exact counterpart of his work in geography. As his chronological studies aimed to furnish the frame for a survey of all time, so far as it relates to man, so his chart was conceived as the frame of man's habitat, the *oikoumene*. Where knowledge failed, wishing as an artist to present a whole, he resorted to conjecture and pieced out the picture with many a *jeu-d'esprit*. He was a character as well as a savant.

Xenophanes of Colophon, a city of Ionia, is said to have flourished in the sixtieth Olympiad (540-537 B.C.), which implies that he was born forty years earlier. A most interesting character, while actually standing apart as a pronounced individualist, he is nevertheless to be regarded as marking the point of transition from the phase of thought characteristic of the Ionians to that of the Italic schools. Like all individualists, he resists classification. How he should be characterized can be determined only after a detailed study of his opinions. In this we are confronted by serious difficulties; for the record is not at all of a piece. On the one hand, we possess a considerable number of fragments of his own works, all in verse, and most of them torn from their contexts; on the other, we find doxographic reports, which represent him as a philosopher reasoning after the manner of Plato and Aristotle. The several pictures of him presented by these sources are difficult or impossible to reconcile. Particularly is this the case if we accept, as some historians do, the account of his thought given in the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *On Melissus, Xenophanes, and Gorgias*, to which we shall presently return; but in hardly less degree is this true also of certain statements of Aristotle and Theophrastus.

From his own words we learn that Xenophanes led a wandering life and lived to an extremely old age, at least ninety-two years, with poetic powers apparently unimpaired. He is sometimes represented as a rhapsode, that is to say, as one who professionally recited the poems of another. This is not warranted by the statement of Diogenes Laertius,¹⁷ who merely says that he recited his own verses. We may infer that he was welcomed at such feasts as he himself describes in one of his poems, and that, like other poets, ancient and modern, he repaid his hosts by contributing to the entertainment. (An anecdote represents him as engaged in conversation with King Hieron,¹⁸ tyrant of Syracuse, who asked Xenophanes how many servants he had, and, being told that he could scarcely support two, retorted, "But Homer, whom you berate, supports a legion even after his death."¹⁹ He is likewise reported to have said that one must approach tyrants either not at all or else as pleasantly as possible.²⁰ One may take this also as referring to Hieron and infer that Xenophanes spent some time at his court. If so, he was probably on the same footing with Simonides, Bacchylides, Pindar, and Aeschylus, but this must have been at the very end of his long life. It is perhaps more probable that he may have had some relation to Gelon, unless the stories are invented and without foundation.) At any rate Xenophanes is to be regarded chiefly as a poet, but a poet with exceptionally wide interests and pronounced views on many subjects.

Of his wanderings and the details of his life we know next to nothing. His departure from Colophon may well have been occasioned by the actual or threatened conquest of the Ionian cities by the Persians. He must be supposed to have spent some time in Elea (Velia), a Phocaean city in southern Italy, founded ca. 553 B. C., the colonization of which he is said to have treated in a poem of some length, as he related the founding of his native Colophon in another poem.²¹ In Elea he is supposed to have influenced Parmenides, who is represented as his pupil;²² though it is impossible to think of him as giving formal instruc-

¹⁷ IX, 18: αὐτὸς ἐπραΰνει τὰ ἑαυτοῦ.

¹⁸ 478-467 B. C. In that case he must have lived at least 100 years as Censorinus says (15, 3).

¹⁹ Plutarch, *Reg. Apophth.* 175 C (Diels-Kranz, 22 A 11).

²⁰ Diogenes Laertius, IX, 19.

²¹ Diogenes Laertius, IX, 20.

²² Diogenes Laertius, IX, 21.

tion. His poems were of different kinds. Those written in elegiacs, if we may judge by the extant fragments, were convivial. The remainder seem to have been written in heroic hexameters and are in a more serious strain. He is credited with a collection of Silli, or lampoons, with parodies, and with a poem entitled *On Nature*. All these titles are subject to suspicion. Probably one and all date from later times, and the last in particular seems to have been ill conceived. The name "lampoons," whether or not chosen by their author, is at any rate appropriate to some of these fragments, and our sources repeatedly refer to the castigation administered by Xenophanes to Homer and Hesiod. They extend this to "all the philosophers"; and one may with probability include in these satirical attacks the reference to Pythagoras' belief in the transmigration of souls. How one is to justify the title *On Nature* is not so evident. There are indeed utterances of the poet regarding the gods which are of a truly philosophic character, but a more suitable name for these would be *On the Gods* or *Of God*. There are other statements in the poet's own words and in the doxographic record relating to matters that fall within the scope of natural philosophy; but there is nothing to show, or even to suggest, that a formal treatise on these subjects was either contemplated or attempted.²³

In considering his opinions we shall begin with those which show him akin to the Milesians. Here we are largely dependent on the doxographic tradition, in which unfortunately in respect to Xenophanes one can have little confidence. If, as seems probable, he wrote no formal treatise *On Nature*, his utterances on the various subjects mentioned may have been made casually and without explanation, leaving those who wished to ascertain his views to infer them. That the inferences were in some instances unjustified is certain, as will presently appear. In other cases one is left in doubt as to his meaning, because our sources, regarding him as the predecessor of Parmenides, interpreted his statements in the light of subsequent thought and gave the result as his own doctrine. There is much in this record to suggest that he presented his views in his *Lampoons* when criticizing the popular opinions regarding the gods. Earth, Sun, Moon, Stars, and Iris (the rainbow) were popularly held

²³ Cf. Burnet, *Early Greek Philosophy*³, pp. 115-16.

to be gods. Xenophanes, rejecting this view, used as a means of combatting it the theories of the Milesians; this he may have done without seriously subscribing to these theories, though of course he may equally well have believed that they were true.

We are told that he held the doctrine of four elements,²⁴ a statement that at least in this form is not to be accepted. At most one may believe that he somewhere, not necessarily in the same connection, mentioned earth, water, air, and fire. Again we are told that he made the dry and the moist, or earth and water, his "principles," and in evidence there are cited his words, "All things that arise and spring into existence are earth and water," the real meaning of which is betrayed by the citation of a Homeric line (*Il.*, H 99), "May ye all turn to water and earth."²⁵ There is here involved no philosophic doctrine of elements but the same view as we have already found in Thales and Anaximander. We are likewise assured that Xenophanes held that there were innumerable worlds.²⁶ If there is any foundation for this statement, we do not know what it was. We shall presently find that he is credited with the view that the world is subject to periodic changes, a new world arising as the old passes away. If he said that this process was eternal, this would account for the doxographic report; or, again, he may have referred to the innumerable host of the heavens in a way to give rise to this statement.

To judge by the record his view of the world was based on the meteoric process attributed generally to the Milesians. The earth naturally is the center of interest. From it arise vapors which form clouds and by progressive sublimation turn to fire, sun, moon, stars, comets, rainbows, St. Elmo's fire. The sun is just a collection of fiery particles spontaneously combining and dissolving day by day; but while it is in the heavens it promotes the meteoric process and is therefore of some use in the world, while the cold moon is a mere "dead-head." But the process reverses itself also; what goes up in evaporation returns in water, and finally the earth either dissolves into water or is reduced to the primal slime. Xenophanes, as has been stated, followed the

²⁴ Diogenes Laertius, IX, 19; cf. Diels, *Doxographi Graeci*, p. 168.

²⁵ Philoponus, *In Aristotelis Physicorum Libros Commentaria*, p. 125, 27-32 (Vitelli) = Diels-Kranz, 21 A 29.

²⁶ Diogenes Laertius, IX, 19.

Milesians in holding that this process had its (presumably) definite periods. He found evidence of a former state in which the earth had been submerged by the sea in marine fossils seen inland and in mountains.²⁷ If he had himself observed all that he mentioned, we should have proof that his wanderings brought him, among other places, to Paros in the Aegean (or Pharos in the Adriatic?), to Malta, and to Syracuse in Sicily. Possibly the observation that water may be found dripping from the roofs of caves may have seemed to him further proof of the tendency of earth (stone) to convert itself into water.

The parts of the world continually undergoing change could not be gods; for God is unchangeable. Sun, moon, and stars pass away; and the rainbow, known as the goddess Iris, and St. Elmo's fire, known as Castor and Pollux, are nothing but clouds. Who would accept them as gods? The earth, too, is subject to change. He said that it was neighbor to the air above, but extended indefinitely downward.²⁸ There is no reason to think that he meant strict infinity. The doxographers, obsessed by the Aristotelian notion that the early thinkers raised the question why the earth does not fall, evidently took the statement to mean this and explained that the earth is not everywhere surrounded (and therefore is not supported) by air.²⁹ If one may hazard a conjecture, Xenophanes may have meant to exclude a Tartarus. Among the phenomena to which he referred, one may mention, aside from lightning, which he may have felt called on to explain in order to dispel the fear of Zeus *Καραϊβάτης*, the eruption of the volcanoes on the Lipari Islands. He is reported to have said that on one occasion the fire failed to show itself for sixteen years and reappeared in the seventeenth.³⁰ Whether this interested him in connection with the periodic cycle one cannot say. The statement of Aëtius that he regarded the earth as compacted of air and fire³¹ may perhaps be founded on a description of a volcano.

Without instituting comparisons or contrasts in detail one readily recognizes in this survey of his opinions about natural phenomena a community of interest and point of view with the Milesians. The agreement, however, does not end there but

²⁷ Cf. Diels-Kranz, 21 A 33.

²⁸ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 28.

²⁹ Cf. Diels-Kranz, 21 A 47.

³⁰ Diels-Kranz, 21 A 48.

³¹ Aëtius, III, 9, 4 (Diels-Kranz, 21 A 47).

extends to the field of history and ethnology. Not only did he compose accounts of the colonization of Colophon and Elea but he displayed a historical outlook in more general ways. He said that the Greeks first learned from Homer³² probably not only that the gods were anthropomorphic and shared the frailties of men³³ but also, as Herodotus believed, the names and functions of the gods;³⁴ and he declared Homer older than Hesiod.³⁵ He derived the love of luxury among the Ionians from the Lydians³⁶ and, probably in the same connection, attributed to the latter the invention of coinage,³⁷ which he may have regarded as the root of all evil. At all events this datum displays his interest in discoveries and inventions (*εὐρήματα*), an interest henceforth destined constantly to engage historians. Whether the myths of culture heroes, like Prometheus, Triptolemus, and Palamedes, and of gods, like Dionysus, had already received wide currency in his day we do not know; apparently he knew and rejected them, as he rejected other myths, declaring, "The gods did not reveal all things to mortals in the beginning, but by searching in the course of time they discover the better."³⁸ In the same spirit as Anaximander he gave his own age in one of his poems³⁹ and suggested as a worthy question, "How old were you when the Mede came?"⁴⁰ One wonders whether, in referring satirically to Pythagoras' belief in transmigration,⁴¹ he attempted to trace the derivation of the belief, perhaps from Egypt, as Herodotus imagined it.⁴² His interest in ethnology he showed in his reference to the snub-nosed black gods of the Ethiopians and the blue-eyed fair gods of the Thracians.⁴³ He is said also to have expressed his admiration for Thales' achievement in astronomy⁴⁴ and to have repeated the rumor that Epimenides attained an age of 154 years,⁴⁵ an interest not improbable, when we reflect that he himself lived long and that his faculties were apparently unimpaired at the age of 92. Whether we are to credit his

³² Diels-Kranz, 21 B 10.

³³ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 11 and 12.

³⁴ Herodotus, II, 53.

³⁵ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 13.

³⁶ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 3.

³⁷ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 4.

³⁸ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 18.

³⁹ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 8.

⁴⁰ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 22.

⁴¹ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 7.

⁴² Herodotus, II, 123.

⁴³ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 16.

⁴⁴ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 19.

⁴⁵ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 20.

reported denunciation of Simonides as a "niggard"⁴⁶ is more questionable.

These data, generally lightly passed over, are of the greatest significance for the spirit of the age. They are characteristic of the latter half of the sixth century, when the foundations of history were being laid and the data began to be assembled which the Sophists and philosophers of the following centuries were to use with freedom as matters of common knowledge.

In all this Xenophanes was essentially following in the footsteps of the Milesians, though it is probable that he varied their theories in detail and added observations of his own, such as those regarding fossils. Whether the earlier Milesians had spoken of fossils we do not know: we have every reason, however, for believing that the observations recorded by Herodotus (II, 12) were derived from Hecataeus, a contemporary of Xenophanes, whose visit to Egypt probably dates about 525 B. C. Without assuming dependence of either on the other one may infer that Milesians had made similar observations before in support of their cosmic theories.

If we are right, however, in our view that Xenophanes introduced his conception of nature in his criticism of the popular theology, we do him no injustice in assuming that all this was of secondary importance to him. His original contribution would then be in another direction. It is not uncommon that one who believes that he has a revolutionary message avails himself of current science in combatting the popular notions which he must overthrow. The more revolutionary his own views, the less concerned he is about the particular weapon he employs in clearing the way for the reception of the new truth.

As has already been suggested, it was in his theology that Xenophanes displayed his originality, and there also, apparently, lay his chief interest. Certainly he departed most widely in this regard from the Milesians. There is no evidence that the latter, with the exception of Hecataeus, were conscious of a break with the religion of their people; for they could still observe the customary rites of the city, and if they were aware of interpreting the gods differently they could point to the accepted authorities, Homer and Hesiod, as not obscurely imply-

⁴⁶ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 21.

ing what they themselves taught. What their theories implied was that the myths current among the people were not to be taken literally, the philosopher recognizing the truth behind the poetic imagery. At all events they were men of science who in sober prose set forth the truth as they saw it.

For Xenophanes the case must necessarily present itself under a different aspect. As a poet, especially as an epic poet, he was inevitably coming into competition with Homer and Hesiod. In his accounts of the founding of Colophon and Elea he must have felt that he was departing from these models, even if he may have woven into his story a certain amount of earlier legend. He belonged to an age in which the poet no longer disappeared from view behind the muse he invoked and the theme that was all in all in the older time. Archilochus, Stesichorus, Sappho, Alcaeus, Mimnermus, Anacreon, Simonides, and Pindar stood out as personalities, each after his kind, and even Hesiod, in the *Works and Days*, the one poem we may certainly attribute to him, had discarded the anonymity of the epic poet. A spirit of criticism was abroad as the complement of the strong expression of one's own opinion. All this made for frank expression of personal views in opposition to what others might think or might have thought.

But with Xenophanes, we must assume, there were other and more important considerations urging him to self-expression. In his criticism of Homer and Hesiod, to which his words and the record bear witness, he was prompted not by a petty jealousy but by something infinitely greater, by moral indignation. Even in a poem for a convivial occasion he cannot refrain from referring to the myths as fictions to be banished from the feast along with factional bickerings.⁴⁷ A pious prayer to the gods for strength to do one's honorable work he commended as most fitting.⁴⁸ In another he takes up the theme of the relative value of wisdom and athletic prowess, which gains all the plaudits and rewards from the vulgar⁴⁹—a theme which Euripides developed and which Plato did not disdain to have Socrates slightly vary in

⁴⁷ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 1, lines 21-23.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, lines 15-16.

⁴⁹ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 2. Cf. Jaeger, *Paideia* (Oxford University Press, 1939), pp. 171-3; but for a different interpretation of this fragment see Bowra, *A. J. P.*, LIX (1938), pp. 257-79.

his own defense, while declaring his exalted mission and his unflinching devotion to it. Nothing, it would seem, could more clearly indicate the spirit that animated Xenophanes in his strictures upon Homer and Hesiod and the unworthy representations of the gods for which he held them accountable.

His conception of God was essentially determined by his moral ideal, as was natural in a man of character and profound convictions; but it was colored also by esthetic predilections and notions of fitness. His moral earnestness appears most strikingly in the indignation he expresses at the characterization of the gods by Homer and Hesiod, who attribute to them all that among men is a shame and a reproach, theft, adultery, and mutual deceit.⁵⁰ Timon described him as wanting in pretense,⁵¹ which may refer to his modest disclaimer of certainty, but must include sincerity and intellectual integrity. The anecdotes told of him emphasize this trait of his character. Aristotle relates that when the people of Elea asked him whether they should mourn Leucothea, he counseled them if they regarded her as a goddess not to mourn her, if as a human being, not to offer her sacrifice.⁵² Plutarch tells similar tales regarding his advice to the Egyptians about Osiris.⁵³ No doubt the stories are apocryphal and were intended primarily to enforce his doctrine that gods are eternal, being neither born nor subject to death; but they illustrate the conviction men had of his integrity. Of like tenor is the anecdote related by Plutarch, who bids one not to look glum or to be afraid when taunted but to do as Xenophanes did, who, when Lasus of Hermione called him a coward because he would not gamble with him, confessed that he was an arrant coward and wanting in courage, when it came to doing anything shameful.⁵⁴ Aristotle reports that according to Xenophanes a challenge to take an oath was not fair as between a pious and an unscrupulous man, but as if a strong man challenged a weakling to engage in a hand-to-hand fight.⁵⁵ In keeping with this obvious integrity is the frank confession of Xenophanes that

⁵⁰ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 11.

⁵¹ Diels-Kranz, 21 A 35.

⁵² Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1400 B 5-8.

⁵³ *De Iside* 379 B, *De Superstitione* 171 D-E.

⁵⁴ *De Vitioso Pudore* 530 E-F.

⁵⁵ Aristotle, *Rhetoric* 1377 A 19-21.

no man, present, past, or future, could know of a certainty what he declared about the gods and the world.⁵⁶ However one takes this utterance it obviously is not the expression of a sceptic, as later writers sought to make it appear; for a sceptic suspends judgment or is indifferent, whereas Xenophanes speaks with conviction. His conviction, however, is not born of knowledge but of faith,—of faith in an ideal projected by his own character. He perceived that the Ethiopian and the Thracian fashioned their gods in their own image: he was naturally not aware that he was doing the same.

Endless questions arise when one asks how Xenophanes conceived of God. The authentic record is scanty and not free from contradiction. "There is one God, supreme among gods and men, like unto mortals neither in body nor in mind."⁵⁷ "He sees all over, thinks all over, and hears all over."⁵⁸ "Without effort he sways all things by the thought of his mind."⁵⁹ "He remains always in the same place unmoved; it beseems him not to fare now hither now thither."⁶⁰ From this description one would conclude that Xenophanes conceived of God as a spirit, after the analogy of his inner self, though without the limitations of man. One need not press the contradiction of "One God, supreme among gods,"⁶¹ because one finds similar incongruities of expression among the Hebrews who were at least trying to be monotheists; nor is one entitled to say that Xenophanes had fully succeeded in this respect. It suffices to recognize an ideal forming and striving to realize itself. To the characterization above given we are justified in adding the thought that God is eternal, not born or subject to death, and that the conception of a god does not comport with the belief that one god can be overlord and another his servant, or that a god should be wanting in anything. All this tends to a spiritual monotheism, however much the thought or the expression may fall short of completely realizing that ideal.

⁵⁶ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 34.

⁵⁷ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 23.

⁵⁸ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 24.

⁵⁹ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 25.

⁶⁰ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 26; cf. Diogenes Laertius, IX, 19: *μὴ μέντοι ἀναπνεῖν*.

⁶¹ Diels-Kranz, 21 B 23, line 1.

Later writers give one a very different conception, representing Xenophanes as identifying God with the world and therefore as being a pantheist. This view seems hard to reconcile with the words of Xenophanes above set forth and is found in authors belonging to the doxographic tradition. We have, therefore, every reason to seek the source of this conception in Aristotle and behind Aristotle we may look for Plato. The latter, in a playful passage,⁶² represents the stranger from Elea as saying that the philosophers clothe their thought in mythical form, as if telling nursery tales, representing the cosmic entities as acting like human beings, fighting with one another or marrying and bringing up children; "but the Eleatic tribe, from our country, beginning with Xenophanes and even farther back, recount their tale, implying that the so-called All is One." At best one can reasonably infer nothing from these words regarding the thought of Xenophanes, except that Plato for whatever reason associated him with the Eleatics, among whom he must have had Parmenides chiefly in mind. Aristotle, however, in this instance, as in others, seems to have taken Plato quite literally and therefore regarded Xenophanes as in his philosophy essentially agreeing with Parmenides. It is this conviction that obviously inspired the reconstruction of the thought of Xenophanes in the Pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *De M. X. G.* Now Aristotle himself in the *Metaphysics*,⁶³ speaking of the Eleatics says: "Parmenides seems to lay hold on that which is one in formula, Melissus on that which is one in matter, for which reason the former says that it is limited, the latter that it is unlimited; while Xenophanes, the first of this school of monists (for Parmenides is said to have been his pupil), gave no clear statement, nor does he seem to have grasped either of these two kinds of unity, but, modeling his conception on the whole heavens, he says the One is God." However we interpret this, we obtain no clear conception. If, as Aristotle implies, Xenophanes gave no hint as to the sense in which he used the term "One," there is no ground in what he says for identifying the One God with the universe. Theophrastus, however, as was his manner, pushed the definition still farther and identified the God of Xenophanes with the

⁶² *Sophist* 242 C-D.

⁶³ *Metaphysics* 986 B 18-24; cf. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Pre-socratic Philosophy*, p. 201, n. 228.

world, saying that God is spherical.⁶⁴ It seems clear that in this he was influenced by the assumption that Xenophanes as the teacher of Parmenides had thought of God as Parmenides imagined the All; but it is hardly conceivable that Plato and Aristotle would have spoken of the relation between these thinkers in such vague and uncertain terms if there were adequate grounds for thinking that one was the teacher of the other. So far as the authentic record goes, the sole point at which their thought agrees is in the emphasis laid upon unity; but the unity is in one case that of God, in the other that of the world. Only if one identified God with the world could one establish a close relation; that was gradually achieved by the tradition, though it was based upon mere conjecture and influenced by the desire to place Xenophanes definitely in the line of school successions.

Viewed dispassionately, Xenophanes appears as a figure set apart. He was essentially a minstrel, who could contribute something to a festive occasion, but a minstrel of rather exceptional character. He was not a Mimnermus or an Anacreon but a man of lofty ideals and strong convictions, which led him not only to criticize sharply the received and current views but also to suggest his own. In this respect he did not stand alone, for other contemporaries did the same. What distinguishes him from them is his earnestness and the sublimity of his conception. If Parmenides caught some of his spirit and applied his thought to his own cosmic philosophy, that is no more than can be said of others who stood in no personal relation to him. Aside from his theological views what we learn about Xenophanes' interests and notions places him entirely in the group of Milesian thinkers, especially with Hecataeus. But in spirit here also he stands apart; for, though each sought to rationalize religion, whereas Hecataeus sought by indirection to undermine current conceptions of the gods, Xenophanes attacked them with indignation. We have in the one a reformer, in the other a rationalist whose weapon is sly ridicule and persiflage.

† W. A. HEIDEL.

⁶⁴ Theophrastus, *Phys. Op.* 5; cf. Diogenes Laertius, IX, 19.

THE GARDEN OF PHOEBUS.

In two recent articles I sought to show that the Latin poets of the first century B. C. did not consider Apollo a sun-god and that as yet the linking of Apollo with Helios was confined to special groups, such as the Stoics.¹ But error dies hard; and I find it necessary to supplement those articles with a short discussion of a special problem.

In his book *The Gates of Dreams* E. L. Highbarger has much to say about a garden of Phoebus at the eastern end of the world where the sun rises.² It was the same as Elysium, the meadow of asphodel, the islands of the blessed, Mount Olympus, and heaven. It was on the Ocean Stream and was the counterpart of the garden of the Hesperides in the west. There Phoebus Apollo, as god of the sun, had his palace. There was the gate of the Sun or gate of Day whence the Sun's chariot issued to light the world. Furthermore this eastern gate, at the junction of earth, heaven, and the lower world, was Homer's ivory gate, the gate of false dreams. Highbarger finds the roots of this concept of a garden of Phoebus in Homer and Hesiod; but it becomes full-blown, he says, in writers of the sixth and fifth centuries, Stesichorus, Sophocles, and Euripides; and Virgil's Elysium (*Aen.*, VI, 637-899) is the garden of Phoebus in its most complete imaginative development.³

The entire argument is complex and elaborate, and to support it Highbarger weaves together evidence from many sources. I am not concerned here with his theory of the gates of dreams but only with the garden of Phoebus, which, one gathers from his book, was a commonplace of the ancient imagination from the sixth to first centuries. If he is right, then Apollo was more commonly considered a sun-god in sixth and fifth century Greece than has recently been supposed, and there is little distinction in Virgil and his contemporaries between Apollo and Sol. For

¹ "Apollo and Sol in the Latin Poets of the First Century B.C.," *T. A. P. A.*, LXX (1939), pp. 439-55; "Apollo and the Sun-God in Ovid," *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 429-44.

² Ernest Leslie Highbarger, *The Gates of Dreams* (Baltimore, Johns Hopkins Press, 1940).

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 56-58, 99-107.

Highbarger's Phoebus is Apollo and he is a sun-god.⁴ It is necessary, therefore, to look at all the evidence upon which Highbarger bases his concept of a garden of Phoebus. This, in fact, comes to no more than five passages:

1) Stesichorus, frag. 6 Diehl, *ap.* Athenaeus, XI, 38, p. 469 (*Oxford Book of Greek Verse*, 161):

Ἀέλιος δ' Ὑπεριονίδας δέπας ἑσκατέβαινεν
 χρύσειον ὄφρα δὲ Ὠκεανοῖο περάσας
 ἀφίκοιθ' ἱερᾶς ποτὶ βένθεα νυκτὸς ἑρεμνᾶς
 ποτὶ ματέρα κουριδίαν τ' ἄλοχον παῖδάς τε φίλους·
 5 ὁ δ' ἐς ἄλσος ἔβα
 δάφναισι κατάσκιον ποσσὶ πάϊς Διός.

These lines are quoted by Athenaeus to illustrate the cup that Helius uses as a boat on the Ocean Stream. They are obviously part of a longer poem. The ὁ δέ is about proof enough that the πάϊς Διός of line 6 is not the Helius of line 1. But Highbarger identifies them, assuming that the son of Zeus is Apollo and that Apollo is the sun.⁵ If the son of Zeus is Apollo, and the

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 57: "... by the sixth century B.C., this Garden had become associated with Phoebus or Apollo, and was now thought to be located in the East, where the Sun rises." *Ibid.*, p. 58: "The 'Gate of the East' was vastly different. It was located in the region of bright day, where the Garden of Apollo was to be found." In my articles cited in note 1 *supra* I showed that the Latin poets used Phoebus as a name of Sol without thereby identifying him with Apollo; but the name *Apollo* and almost all other names and epithets of Apollo were never applied by them to the sun-god.

⁵ But he is not entirely clear about this. Such an identification seems implicit in his discussion on pp. 56 f. But on p. 53 he says, "He tells us how Helios once sailed in his *golden* cup over Ocean to the depths of Night, there to join his mother, wife, and children; but Apollo withdrew to the deep shade of his sacred grove of laurel." Here ὁ δέ is interpreted correctly. See H. W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York, etc., American Book Co., 1920), § 1112.

In passing I might point out that Highbarger misinterprets the first four lines. He says that Helius *once* sailed in his cup and that he sailed to the depths of night. But the idea is the same as that found in Mimnermus, frag. 10 Diehl (*Oxford Book of Greek Verse*, 120): when Helius reaches his western goal he must get into his boat (which is sometimes represented as a cup) and be carried back, while he sleeps, to his eastern palace, so that he can start the new day. Again Highbarger seems to vary in his interpretation; on the very next page (54), where he speaks of Mimnermus' poem, he seems to have the correct interpretation.

mention of a grove of laurel is a reason for supposing so, then we have a passage that is like several in Homer, where the rising or setting of Helios is fancifully expressed in a sentence of one or more verses to mark the time when the action of the following sentence took place.⁶ But it is more likely that C. M. Bowra is right in supposing that Heracles is meant and that Stesichorus tells how he reached the west by sailing in the sun's cup on the Ocean Stream.⁷

2) Sophocles, frag. 870 Nauck, *ap.* Strabo, VII, 3, 1, p. 295. It is desirable that I also quote Strabo's surrounding text; he is discussing Germany:

διὰ δὲ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῶν τόπων τούτων οἱ τὰ Ῥιπαῖα ὄρη καὶ τοὺς Ὑπερβορείους μυθοποιούντες λόγον ἡξιώνται . . . ἐκείνοι μὲν οὖν εἰσθωσαν· οὐδὲ γὰρ εἴ τινα Σοφοκλῆς τραγωδεῖ περὶ τῆς Ὀρειθυίας λέγων ὡς ἀναρπαγείσα ὑπὸ Βορέου κομισθείη

ὑπέρ τε πόντον πάντ' ἐπ' ἔσχατα χθονός
νυκτός τε πηγὰς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπνυχάς
Φοῖβον τε παλαιὸν κῆπον,

οὐδὲν ἂν εἴη πρὸς τὰ νῦν, ἀλλ' ἐατέον . . .

This is the only passage cited by Highbarger in which such a phrase as Φοῖβον κῆπος occurs. But, if the three verses are read by themselves, they appear to prove his concept. They mention the ends of the earth, the springs of night, the regions where the canopy of the sky, so to speak, unfolds; and here is the garden of Phoebus, who to Sophocles must be Apollo.

The context of this quotation in Strabo's *Geography* shows, however, that the ἔσχατα χθονός are the land of the Hyperboreans and that Sophocles is telling the story of how Boreas carried off Oreithyia. The ancients almost unanimously placed the Hyperboreans in the farthest north, interpreting their name as "dwellers beyond the north wind."⁸ It is true that this etymology is disputed by Farnell and others.⁹ But, whatever the

⁶ See *Il.*, II, 48-51, VII, 421-23; VIII, 1-3; XI, 1-4; *Od.*, II, 388 f.; III, 1-5.

⁷ C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1936), pp. 86-88.

⁸ See Pindar, *Ol.*, 3, 31; Callimachus, *Hymn* 4, 281 f.; Diodorus Siculus, II, 47, 1; Pausanias, V, 7, 7.

⁹ L. R. Farnell, *The Cults of the Greek States*, IV (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1907), pp. 99-111; O. Crusius, *s. v.* "Hyperboreer," *Myth. Lex.*,

truth of their interpretation, there is no denying that most ancient writers who mention the Hyperboreans give them a northern home.¹⁰ There were a few, however, who placed the Hyperboreans in the same region as the Hesperides and Atlas;¹¹ this seems to show a tendency to link the north and west, just as the south and east were linked in ancient concepts of the Aethiopian land.

In *νυκτός τε πηγὰς οὐρανοῦ τ' ἀναπνοχάς* we seem at first glance to have phrases more appropriate to east and west than to the far north. But the first phrase is, I am sure, an allusion to the polar night. The second phrase is an allusion to the hinges of the world, in this case the north pole. The whole verse is made clear by passages in Pomponius Mela and Pliny the Elder.¹² I quote Pliny:

Pone eos montes ultraque Aquilonem gens felix, si credimus, quos Hyperboreos appellavere, annoso degit aevo, fabulosis celebrata miraculis. ibi creduntur esse cardines mundi extremique siderum ambitus semenstri luce solis adversi . . . semel in anno solstitio oriuntur iis soles brumaeque semel occidunt.¹³

If *νυκτός πηγαί* did have reference to the sun's daily course, it

I, 2829-31; H. J. Rose, *A Handbook of Greek Mythology* (London, Methuen, 1928), pp. 135 f. But see Joseph Wells, *A Commentary on Herodotus*, I (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912), pp. 313 f., on Herodotus, IV, 32-36.

¹⁰ *Homeric Hymn* 7, 28 f. and Pindar, *Isthm.*, 5 (6), 23 make the Hyperboreans the antithesis of Egypt or of the Nile's source, i. e. of the far south. On the northern home of the Hyperboreans see Herodotus, IV, 13, 32 f. and 36; Phereclus, *ap. Schol. Pind. Olymp.*, 3, 16 (28); Mela, III, 5, 36; Pliny, *N. H.*, IV, 89.

¹¹ See Apollodorus, II, 5, 11.

¹² *Locc. citt.* in note 10 *supra*. Herodotus, IV, 25, 1 speaks of the six months' sleep of the people who lived in the unknown regions of farthest Scythia; and Joseph Wells, *op. cit.* (see note 9 *supra*), p. 311, is undoubtedly right in supposing this to be a confused tradition of the long polar night. Herodotus, IV, 31 mentions the heavy snowfall of the Scythian winter, which may have strengthened the tradition of Hyperborean night. The friendship of Sophocles and Herodotus and Sophocles' debt to Herodotus for geographical lore are well known.

¹³ See Mela, III, 5, 36: in Asiatico litore primi Hyperborei super Aquilonem Rhiphaeosque montes sub ipso siderum cardine jacent, ubi sol non cotidie ut nobis, sed primum verno aequinoctio exortus autumnali demum occidit; ideo sex mensibus dies et totidem aliis nox usque continuata est.

would more naturally mean the west, not the east; so that, even if we attach importance to the rare evidence that connects the Hyperboreans with the Hesperides, we are far from having an eastern garden of Phoebus.

Furthermore Sophocles is telling us that Boreas, the north wind, carried Oreithyia to the ends of the earth, which would obviously mean his own northern home. In the usual tradition he takes her to Thrace,¹⁴ which meant much the same thing to the earliest Greeks as Scythia meant to later Greeks; that is, it meant the regions of the north, a land of strange peoples.¹⁵

Now the Hyperborean land could properly be called Φοίβου κήπος by Sophocles. It was a land that Apollo favored very much. All the Hyperborean people were virtually priests of Apollo, ever worshipping him and singing hymns in his honor. And they were often represented as living in a sort of paradise, in a pleasant land on the Ocean Stream, north of the northern cold.¹⁶

3) Sophocles, frag. 297 Nauck, *ap.* Stobaeus, *Flor.*, 103, 10:

ἐν Διὸς κήποις ἀρουῖσθαι μόνον εὐδαίμονας (or εὐδαίμονος) ὄλβους.

Of this Highbarger (p. 57) says, "The more general conception of the 'Garden of the Gods' is also found," and adds in a note (30), "specifically of Zeus." Stobaeus quotes this verse in his chapter entitled Περὶ εὐδαιμονίας. It is simply a proverb, a γνώμη. The text is uncertain, but its meaning seems to be: only the

¹⁴ See Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.*, I, 211-18; Schol. on Apoll. Rhod. *Arg.*, I, 211; Ovid, *Met.*, VI, 682-713. See Eva Frank, *s. v.* "Oreithyia," *R.-E.*, XVIII, cols. 954 f.

¹⁵ H. L. Jones, in his edition of Strabo, III (London and New York, *L. C. L.*, 1924), notes on pp. 174 f., believes that Sophocles' verses refer to all four directions; the second line, then, would mean west and east, and the garden of Phoebus would be the south. He supposes that Boreas carried Oreithyia off to all ἔσχατα χθονός before settling down with her in the north. But there is no evidence, nor is it likely, that Boreas took Oreithyia in any direction but northwards.

¹⁶ On Apollo's relation to the Hyperboreans and the nature of their land see Alcaeus, frag. 2 Bergk, *ap.* Himerius, *Or.*, 14, 10; Bacchylides, 3, 58-60; Herodotus, IV, 33-35; Hecataeus of Abdera, frag. 4 Mueller (*F. H. G.*, II, 387), *ap.* Aelian, *H. A.*, XI, 1; Diodorus Siculus, II, 47, 2 f. and 6; Apollonius Rhodius, *Arg.*, II, 674 f., IV, 612-14; Phereclus, *loc. cit.* (see note 10 *supra*). See Daebritz, *s. v.* "Hyperboreer." *R.-E.*, IX, cols. 261-67.

fortunate cultivate the gardens of Zeus.¹⁷ It has nothing whatever to do with east or west, north or south.

4) Euripides, *Phaethon*, frag. 771 Nauck and frag. 773 Nauck, 15-18. In these verses Highbarger says that the concept of the garden of Phoebus "composed of dark laurel" ¹⁸ becomes wholly explicit. I find in them, however, only Ἡλίου δόμους and φαεινὰς Ἡλίου ἱπποστάσεις. Highbarger has no difficulty in proving that these were located by Euripides in the far east. There is no mention of a garden.

5) Virgil, *Aeneid*, VI, 637-899. This is Virgil's description of Elysium, which, says Highbarger (p. 101), "is clearly the 'Garden of Phoebus'." He also says (p. 103), "... he (Virgil) could best symbolize it by the 'Grove of Phoebus,' which in myth was located in the East, by the Gate of the Sun. But Elysium was also heaven and therefore located in the sky." "For these reasons it seems proper to speak . . . of his Elysium as the 'Garden of Phoebus'" (p. 104). "Since in Vergil's own words Elysium is the realm of the sun and Apollo . . ." (p. 106), "... the sun was the bright luminary of Elysium and was associated with Apollo . . ." (p. 107). How is Highbarger so certain that Elysium was the realm of Apollo? He relies upon verses 656-665, where, he says, "The noble company of Phoebus is described":

conspicit ecce alios dextra laevaue per herbam
vescentis laetumque choro paeana canentis
inter odoratum lauri nemus, unde superne
plurimus Eridani per silvam volvitur amnis.
660 hic manus ob patriam pugnando volnera passi,
quique sacerdotes casti, dum vita manebat,
quique pii vates et Phoebæ digna locuti,
inventas aut qui vitam excoluere per artis,
quique sui memores aliquos fecere merendo:
665 omnibus his nivea cinguntur tempora vitta.

But Virgil is saying that Aeneas and the Sibyl have come to the company of the blessed, men who were heroes and benefactors upon earth. The group (*manus*) is made up of great warriors,

¹⁷ See the conjecture quoted by Nauck: ἐν Διὸς κήποις ἀροῦσι μῦνον ἄνδρες ἄλβιοι.

¹⁸ Apparently a translation of Stesichorus' words ἄλσος δάφναισι κατὰσκιον.

priests, bards and prophets (*vates*), artists and inventors (663), and philanthropists (664). Only of the *vates* does Virgil say *Phoebo digna locuti*, which must mean that what they had spoken and sung in life was worthy of Phoebus Apollo; whether we take *vates* as bards or as prophets or as both, their patron was Apollo. These words do not justify anyone in calling the whole group a company of Phoebus.

Highbarger also points to *lauri nemus* in 658. The laurel was especially sacred to Apollo, but it was also closely connected with the spirits of the dead and Hecate.¹⁹ For that reason the laurel is a fitting tree for a grove in Elysium. Again, the blessed are singing a joyful paean, and the paean was in origin a song in honor of Apollo. But Virgil is obviously alluding to the Homeric custom of singing the paean after a feast;²⁰ for the blessed have been feasting.²¹ In any case a laurel grove and a paean are slender support for calling Elysium a garden of Phoebus.²²

And why is Highbarger so certain that Elysium is the realm of the Sun? His sole support must be verse 641: *solemque suum, sua sidera norunt*. But he has ignored *suum* and *sua* (see p. 101). Obviously Virgil is saying that the blessed in Elysium have their own sun and their own stars, which are not the sun and stars of earth.²³ And Virgil makes it plain enough that Elysium is in the lower world and not in the sky. See *superne*

¹⁹ See M. B. Ogle, "Laurel in Ancient Religion and Folklore," *A. J. P.*, XXXI (1910), pp. 287-311, an article that is cited by Highbarger on p. 101, n. 140.

²⁰ See *Il.*, I, 473, *καλὸν αἰδόντες παῖχονα*, with which compare *laetum paeanum canentis*.

²¹ Highbarger says (p. 102), "Food . . . is not mentioned here . . ." But what does *vescentis* mean in 657?

²² I might add that Orpheus, son and bard of Apollo, is present (645-47). But where would Orpheus be, if not in Elysium? There is no evidence anywhere that Apollo, or Helios either, was especially concerned with the Elysian fields; see Waser, s. v. "Elysion," *R.-E.*, V, cols. 2470-76.

²³ Highbarger also makes a mistake in assigning Orcus to the moon. He says, "This dark region was said to be illumined by the faint light of the moon, which was closely associated with Hecate and Diana." He cites *Aen.*, VI, 268-72 and 451-54. But in these passages the light of the underworld is compared to the light of a partly obscured moon. Highbarger himself on p. 99 recognizes that these passages are similes.

in verse 658 of the quotation above, and *ad caelum hinc ire* in 719, where *hinc* must refer to the place where Aeneas and Anchises are.²⁴

This review of the evidence on which Highbarger supports his view shows that the ancients had no established tradition of a special Garden of Phoebus in the east or anywhere else. The term occurs but once as a poetic designation of the Hyperborean land.

JOSEPH FONTENROSE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY.

²⁴ See also VI, 750: *supera ut convexa revisant*. According to Highbarger, Aeneas and the Sibyl leave Elysium by the ivory gate (VI, 898) because it is the eastern gate of the Sun, and Elysium, which is in the sky, is his garden in the east. This can no longer be maintained, once his ideas about Virgil's Elysium are proved unsound. I am sure that Norden, Mackail, and other commentators are right in supposing that Aeneas leaves by the ivory gate because he leaves before midnight, probably at sunset or just after; and it is the ivory gate that is open before midnight; Horace, *Sat.*, I, 10, 33. This is not far-fetched, as H. E. Butler says; it is a very clever touch. It is absurd to suppose, as Highbarger does (p. 95 with n. 116), that Aeneas stayed twenty-four hours in Orcus and Elysium. His argument rests upon a misinterpretation of *tendit sub umbras* in VI, 578 and an assumption that Aeneas went all the way down to Tartarus. Any further discussion of the problems of *Aeneid* VI lies beyond the province of this paper. Whatever Virgil's Elysium may be, it is not a garden of Phoebus.

ALEXANDER'S DEIFICATION.

Divine monarchy in western civilization—an institution whose long history extends from Hellenistic Kings, Roman Emperors, and Mediaeval Popes to the Hapsburgs and other despots of yesterday who ruled by the grace of God, and survives, perhaps, in a perverted form today—dates from the divine honors which Alexander the Great received on his death. The purpose of this paper is to discover what impetus, if any, the living Alexander gave to the idea, for, even though we do not know whether he decreed his deification, there are certain scholars who write as if he did,¹ and in any case the issue is by no means clear-cut. It would serve no useful purpose to recapitulate here all the various arguments on the subject, though we may examine the ancient evidence and the best opinions representing the modern points of view, in the hope that new light may be shed on Alexander.²

This paper makes three chief points. In the first place, Alexander did not go to the oracle of Ammon to learn his origin, nor did he learn it; his purpose in going was primarily a military one. Secondly, I follow Tarn in rejecting Miss Taylor's interpretation of the proskynesis scene at Bactra, and I accept Tarn's statement (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 399) that Alexander's motive was not ceremonial but political. But at this point I differ with Tarn in one or two important particulars. I believe that Alex-

¹ D. G. Hogarth, "The Deification of Alexander the Great," *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, II (1887), pp. 317 ff., best expresses the point of view at the opposite extreme. He alludes to the earlier literature on the subject, examines the ancient evidence, and absolves Alexander of decreeing his deification or wishing it. But the paper leaves much to be desired and was answered by Niese, *Hist. Zeit.*, LXXIX (1897), pp. 1 ff. and by Ed. Meyer, *Kleine Schriften* (2nd ed.), I, pp. 312 ff.

² The modern literature on Alexander's deification is extensive, but the works cited in the footnotes will, I believe, set the reader on the track of a full bibliography. There is a bibliography in *C. A. H.*, VI, pp. 598 ff.; see, too, the scattered footnotes in *Hist. Grecque*, IV, 1. I have corresponded with Professor Arthur D. Nock of Harvard University on this subject and wish to express my gratitude for his kind help. I am not noticing modern writers who argue about Alexander from the point of view of the practice in later times, since the Hellenistic ruler-cult, for example, cannot be considered as evidence for Alexander.

ander deliberately planned to be deified at Bactra, not that "with prostration he began to feel his way." Furthermore, I believe it is wrong to say that "both Alexander and Hephaestion believed that Callisthenes would aid them, as was natural after his story of the sea prostrating itself before the king." For the past two years, probably, Callisthenes had been a member of the opposition. And I do not think it is possible to evaluate correctly the banquet at Bactra, unless it is taken in conjunction with certain of Alexander's other actions during the previous two years. When that is done, Alexander stands forth in a new light. And in the third place, I agree with Tarn that Alexander's edict for his deification, after his return from India, was political, but I do not believe that it had any special connection with the decree concerning the exiles. Alexander's motive is more clearly understood when viewed in the light of the mutiny at Opis. Arrian's account of this mutiny is, I believe, universally accepted (except by Hogarth who, however, denies that Alexander ordered his deification or wished it), but the account does not make sense. If we accept Justin's account, on the other hand, new light is thrown on Alexander's motive in ordering his deification at this time.

1. The trip to the oracle of Ammon.³ Plutarch tells us that "when Alexander had passed through the desert and was come to the place of the oracle, the prophet of Ammon gave him salutation from the god as from a father. . . . And then, regarding his own empire, Alexander asked whether it was given to him to become lord and master of all mankind."⁴ The god

³ The references for the five Alexander-historians are: Arrian, III, 3, 5; Diodorus, XVII, 49, 2; Justin, XI, 11, 2; Curtius, IV, 7, 16; Plutarch, 26, 6. I have used (with slight changes) Chinnock's translation of Arrian and Perrin's translation of Plutarch (*Loeb Classical Library*). See, too, Callisthenes, frag. 14 in the edition of Jacoby; Cohen, *Mnemosyne*, LIV (1926), pp. 83 ff.; Wilcken, *Berl. Sitzb.*, 1928, pp. 576 ff.; 1930, pp. 159 ff.; Pasquali, *Riv. Fil.*, LVII (1929), pp. 513 ff.; LVIII (1930), pp. 342 ff.; Larsen, *Class. Phil.*, XXVII (1932), pp. 70 ff., 274 ff. The bibliographies (often with summaries) in *J. E. A.* are valuable; see especially XIII (1927), p. 104; XIV (1928), p. 145; XV (1929), p. 122; XVI (1930), p. 129; XVII (1931), p. 128; XIX (1933), p. 79; XXII (1936), p. 60.

⁴ This is enough to condemn the entire passage, for no such thoughts can be ascribed to Alexander at this time. The priest no doubt greeted

gave answer that this was given to him. . . . This is what most writers state regarding the oracular responses; but Alexander himself in a letter to his mother says that he received certain secret responses, which he would tell to her, and to her alone, on his return. And some say that the prophet, wishing to show his friendliness by addressing him with 'O paidion,' or *O my son*, in his foreign pronunciation ended the words with 's' instead of 'n,' and said, 'O paidios,' and that Alexander was pleased at the slip in pronunciation, and a story became current that the god had addressed him with 'O pai Dios,' or *O son of Zeus*."

Though Plutarch himself does not feel certain on the matter, some modern scholars do. Wilcken,⁵ for example, says that Alexander "was saluted as son of Zeus! It must have entered his soul like a flash of lightning and caused the deepest emotion." Reinmuth⁶ remarks that "the way for this step [deification] had been prepared by the declaration of the oracle of Ammon that he was the son of Zeus," while Prentice⁷ says that "the only thing that is surely known about Alexander's visit is that he presented himself in person before the shrine, and was there officially addressed as the son of the god. . . . Alexander from now on was declared and declared himself to be of divine origin." Nock⁸ says, "Acknowledged by the god Ammon as his son, Alexander retained his belief in the supremacy of Zeus, a belief intimate and almost mystical."

him, as he would any Pharaoh, as the son of Ammon, but that is beside the point, having no significance beyond Egypt; the story derives from Callisthenes (discussed by Larsen, see note 3 *supra*).

⁵ U. Wilcken, *Alexander the Great*, translated by G. C. Richards (New York, 1932), p. 127.

⁶ O. W. Reinmuth, "Alexander and the World-State," in *The Greek Political Experience*, edited by A. C. Johnson and others (Princeton, 1941), p. 120.

⁷ W. K. Prentice, *The Ancient Greeks* (Princeton, 1940), p. 238.

⁸ *Hellenistic Religion—The Two Phases* (*Syllabus of Gifford Lectures*, University of Aberdeen, 1939), p. 9. W. S. Ferguson ("Legalized Absolutism En Route from Greece to Rome," *A. H. R.*, XVIII [1912], pp. 29 ff.): "The greeting of Ammon, whose influence had waxed in Greece as that of Delphi had waned, gave them [the cities] an adequate pretext to accede to his suggestion [to enroll him among their gods]; for, once Zeus through his most authoritative oracle had recognized Alexander as his son, no valid objection could be offered to his deification even by men who, in this general age of indifference, retained their faith in supernatural powers or their aversion to religious change."

Arrian gives a different account: "Alexander then was struck with wonder at the place, and consulted the oracle of the god. Having heard what was agreeable to his wishes, as he himself said, he set out on the journey back to Egypt." Since this is all that Arrian tells about the response of the oracle, it is all that we shall ever know,⁹ for Ptolemy was his source and we may be quite sure that, if Alexander had been called the son of Zeus, Ptolemy would have mentioned it as propaganda to give himself status.¹⁰

Why, then, did Alexander make the hazardous journey to the oracle of Ammon? As is the case with such matters, various motives were probably at work. There was, for example, the youthful love of adventure as well as the desire to see the famous oracle, so respected by Greeks, and to consult it, as he once had Delphi, about his future, a future which he had outlined in his letter to Darius¹¹ and must soon test in battle; and perhaps he wished to please the Egyptians by going through ancient rituals. Wilcken¹² makes a good deal of Arrian's statement that a "longing seized" Alexander to visit the oracle. It was Wilcken, as is well known, who first called particular attention to Alexander's "longing," but he overstates his case.¹³ I do not

⁹ That various stories circulated later, just as they did about Olympias' relations with Zeus, has nothing to do with the point. An extreme reconstruction of this episode is G. Radet, *Notes critiques sur l'Histoire d'Alexandre* (Bordeaux, 1925); reviewed by W. W. Tarn, *C. R.*, XL (1926), p. 68.

¹⁰ In the last stage across the desert the guide lost his way, and according to one story the party was guided by two snakes. Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 378, n. 1) says, "As this story is Ptolemy's, they conceivably represented the Alexandrian serpents Thermouthis and Psois; for Psois—fortune deified—became identified with Ptolemy's new god Sarapis, who thus aided Alexander."

¹¹ Arrian, II, 25, 3.

¹² *Op. cit.*, pp. 121 ff. See, too, V. Ehrenberg, *Alexander and the Greeks* (Oxford, 1938), chap. II.

¹³ In his hero-worship of Alexander, Wilcken often obscures the point. When, for example, Alexander reached the Danube (Arrian, I, 3 f.), a "longing seized" him to cross the river. But it is also true that the Triballians had 15,000 allies across the river and by crossing against them he hastened the surrender of the Triballians. Wilcken is aware of this, and yet he can say (*op. cit.*, p. 68), "This was the non-rational longing for the unknown, the uninvestigated and mysterious, which in his later years took him irresistibly to the ends of the earth." This

deny the romantic and irrational strain in Alexander's nature, but I would insist that Alexander often preferred, for one reason or another, to keep his plans to himself and urged his men on, or concealed his motives, by an appeal to the memory of Achilles or Heracles; where this was not possible, or sufficient, he mentioned his own longing. Thus I would place high among his reasons for going to the oracle of Ammon his desire to confirm that the Libyan desert was in fact a frontier. Just as he crossed the Danube and Jaxartes to make his power known among the tribes, so here he marched along the shore,¹⁴ and it is no coincidence that at Paraetonium, the point where he left the coast, he was met by envoys from Cyrene who offered submission.¹⁵ I do not count among his motives any desire to learn about his origin,¹⁶ for in that case he would have made immediate capital of his trip, whereas in actual fact we hear no more of it for several years.

2. The banquet at Bactra.¹⁷ Arrian's version is to be pre-

method leads to unfortunate implications about Alexander's divinity; for example, though Alexander has proceeded no further than Gordium, Wilcken says (p. 95), "In view of the rapid victorious advance of the young hero, how could it be doubted that he was under the special protection of the gods?"

¹⁴ The regular route to the oracle was direct from Memphis (the way he returned).

¹⁵ Diodorus, XVII, 49, 2; Curtius, IV, 7, 9. Arrian, Justin, and Plutarch do not mention this.

¹⁶ It is true that Arrian (III, 3, 2) says that "Alexander made the expedition to Ammon with the design of learning his origin more certainly, or at least that he might be able to say that he had learned it." Arrian assigns four other motives to Alexander in this passage. It is another instance of Arrian trying to make up his mind.

¹⁷ The references for the Alexander-historians are: Arrian, IV, 10 f.; Justin, XII, 7; Curtius, VIII, 5 f.; Plutarch, 54. There is a lacuna in Diodorus at this point, although from the table of contents of Book XVII it seems clear that he wrote of the banquet. See, too, Athenaeus, X, 434 A-D; Plutarch, *Quaest. Conviv.*, 623 F-624 A; *De cohibenda ira* 454 E. Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 398) says that "some time after 330 he [Callisthenes] had sent to Greece for publication his history of Alexander, so far as it had gone." Unless we are to quibble, this means that Callisthenes' history did not include his version of the banquet at Bactra. Obviously, it would be of the greatest importance if we could prove otherwise. I have argued that Callisthenes' history certainly extended into the year 328 ("The Seer Aristander," *A. J. P.*, L [1929],

ferred, and in a condensed form is as follows: An arrangement was made between Alexander and the sophists in conjunction with the most illustrious of the Persians and Medes that the topic of proskynesis should be mentioned at a banquet at Bactra. When Anaxarchus, then, had spoken, those who were privy to the plan applauded his speech, and wished at once to begin the ceremony of proskynesis. Most of the Macedonians, however, were vexed and kept silence, but Callisthenes opposed him in a vigorous speech. "Thus Callisthenes greatly annoyed Alexander, but spoke the exact sentiments of the Macedonians. When Alexander perceived this, he sent to prevent the Macedonians from making any further mention of the ceremony of proskynesis. But after the discussion silence ensued; and then the most honorable of the Persians arose in due order and prostrated their bodies before him. But when one of the Persians seemed to have performed the ceremony in an awkward way, Leonnatus, a Companion, laughed at his posture as mean. Alexander at the time was angry with him for this, but was afterwards reconciled to him. The following account has also been given: ¹⁸ Alexander drank from a golden goblet the health of the circle of guests, and

pp. 195 ff.) and very probably up to the (third) visit to Bactra in the early spring of 327 (*The Ephemerides of Alexander's Expedition* [Providence, 1932], p. 70, where it is also argued that Callisthenes' account rests on the official *Ephemerides*). I have also argued that it was during this stay at Bactra that Callisthenes was arrested ("Two Notes on the History of Alexander the Great. I. The Arrest and Death of Callisthenes," *A. J. P.*, LIII [1932], pp. 353 ff.). Callisthenes was arrested in connection with the conspiracy of the pages. The banquet was earlier, though during this same stay at Bactra. Presumably there was time, therefore, for Callisthenes to write up the momentous events of the banquet; whether he did or not, we shall never know, but we do know that he wrote his history methodically.

¹⁸ According to Arrian's statement in his Preface, this is his method (not consistently followed, however) of informing us that he is no longer following Ptolemy and Aristobulus (hence, Callisthenes and the *Ephemerides*) as his source, though there is no certainty as to his source for the preceding (see note 23 *infra*). These *λεγόμενα* must always be carefully scrutinized, for study shows that they are often ill-founded (see my *Ephemerides*, pp. 13 ff.), and I would question the details of the remainder of the quotation (which is Chares—used also by Plutarch). Tarn (see *infra*) shows that we have to deal with a Macedonian, not a Greek, banquet; see, however, G. H. Macurdy, "The Grammar of Drinking Healths," *A. J. P.*, LIII (1932), pp. 168 ff.

handed it first to those with whom he had concerted the ceremony of proskynesis. The first who drank from the goblet rose up and performed the act of proskynesis, and received a kiss from him. This ceremony proceeded from one to another in due order. But when the pledging of health came to the turn of Callisthenes, he rose up and drank from the goblet, and drew near, wishing to kiss Alexander without performing the act of proskynesis. Alexander happened then to be conversing with Hephaestion, and consequently did not observe whether Callisthenes performed the ceremony completely or not.¹⁹ But when Callisthenes was approaching to kiss him, Demetrius, son of Pythonax, one of the Companions, said that he was doing so without having prostrated himself. So Alexander would not permit him to kiss him; whereupon the philosopher said, 'Well, then, I'll go away the poorer by a kiss.'²⁰

¹⁹ Callisthenes was just the person whom Alexander would have watched.

²⁰ Callisthenes had done his share to make Alexander appear as a god to Greeks (cf. his account of the sea waves doing obeisance before Alexander at Mount Climax, and his account of Ammon's salutation, which was confirmed by the oracles of Didyma and Erythrae). To explain Callisthenes' *volte face* is a major problem of the historian, for obviously Aristotle's remark (Plutarch, 54, 1) that his nephew lacked common sense will not suffice. Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 400) says that Callisthenes "suddenly found himself (as he thought) faced with the terrible consequences of what he had done; the god he had made meant to act as such. . . . He tried to draw back, too late." Callisthenes clearly tried to draw back, but not merely from a god. Alexander had also recently conceived the idea of world conquest (see *infra*). And I think that we may be even more precise. I have argued that Callisthenes is responsible for all the references to Aristander (see note 17 *supra* and my paper on Aristander). Almost the last reference to Aristander is Arrian, IV, 4, 3, where Alexander has ordered sacrifices preparatory to crossing the Jaxartes: "The victims proved to be unfavorable. Alexander was much annoyed. . . . He again offered sacrifice with a view to crossing; and Aristander the seer told him that the omens still portended danger to himself. . . . Aristander refused to explain the will of the gods contrary to the revelations made by the deity simply because Alexander wished to hear the contrary." That Aristander should stick to his guns at this critical time, without support, is difficult to believe. Our sources do not tell us in so many words, but it seems clear nevertheless that there was determined opposition to Alexander in 329 (which the executions of Philotas and Parmenio had failed to crush). Callisthenes' *volte face*, then, may

The ceremony of proskynesis has engaged Miss Taylor's attention in two able articles and a book.²¹ Tarn and Nock sum up the whole argument so well that we may briefly summarize their replies. Tarn contends that it is wrong to say that the founder of the official ruler-cult was not Ptolemy II but Alexander. Alexander could not have been its author, for there was not in Persia any general worship or cult of the king's daemon, such as Alexander might know of or be influenced by, and that is what matters. Proskynesis before the actual Persian king was not an act of worship. It is likewise wrong to say that the Hellenistic ruler-cult was a cult, not of the ruler, but of his daemon; what was worshipped was the actual man of flesh and blood. At Greek dinners, furthermore, it was the custom to conclude dinner by passing round a cup of unmixed wine, each guest taking a sip and saying ἀγαθὸν δαίμονος. But no such thing happened at Macedonian dinners—ἀγαθὸς δαίμων is not mentioned at Bactra—and there is no evidence that it was a Greek dinner that night at Bactra. That night Alexander and his friends made a libation; they did not pass a cup around, but each drew a portion of wine from a great bowl, and all then made a libation simultaneously at a signal.

Nock likewise denies that there was a Persian precedent for ruler worship, directed to the king's *fravashi* or attendant spirit;

not have been as "sudden" as it appears; perhaps his attitude had been changing during the past two years and was shared by others. See, too, in a general way, Plutarch, 53-54.

²¹ L. R. Taylor, "The 'Proskynesis' and the Hellenistic Ruler-cult," *J.H.S.*, XLVII (1927), pp. 53 ff.; "The Cult of Alexander at Alexandria," *Class. Phil.*, XXII (1927), pp. 162 ff.; *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor* (Middletown, 1931). The articles were answered by Tarn, "The Hellenistic Ruler-cult and the Daemon," *J.H.S.*, XLVIII (1928), pp. 206 ff.; the book was reviewed by Nock, *Gnomon*, VIII (1932), pp. 513 ff. Tarn was answered by Miss Taylor, "Alexander and the Serpent of Alexandria," *Class. Phil.*, XXV (1930), pp. 375 ff. (but see Nock in *Gnomon*). See, too, P. Schnabel, "Die Begründung des hellenistischen Königs Kultes durch Alexander," *Klio*, XIX (1924), pp. 113 ff.; Nock, "Notes on Ruler-cult," *J.H.S.*, XLVIII (1928), pp. 21 ff.; Macurdy, "The Refusal of Callisthenes to drink the Health of Alexander," *J.H.S.*, L (1930), pp. 294 ff.; H. Hurst, "Proskynein," *Neutest. Forsch.*, III (1932); Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, II, pp. 157 ff.; *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewiss.*, XI, pp. 132 ff.; Kleinknecht, *Arch. f. Religionswiss.*, XXXIV, pp. 308 ff.; E. R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* (New Haven, 1938).

that the cult of the founders and saviors of cities in the fourth century B. C. was a cult of the daemon of the individual; that the proskynesis addressed to Alexander at Bactra involved his association with Agathos Daimon or that at Alexandria his cult was so associated. Alexander did not establish a Reichskult; between his death and the first Hellenistic official ruler worship lies a generation spent in reversing his policy.

It is clear that in introducing proskynesis Alexander had no desire to appear as a god to Persians. The alternative, however, is not that Alexander simply wished from all what the Achaemenid kings had received ²²—we are not dealing with a question of polite etiquette, which was designed to put Greeks, Macedonians, and Persians on one plane. The truth is that Alexander wished homage as a divine personage, a fact that we have been inclined to overlook in our examination (from a Persian point of view) of proskynesis. Let us return to Arrian's introductory remarks: ²³ "As to Callisthenes' opposition to Alexander in regard to the ceremony of proskynesis, there is the following story. An arrangement was made between Alexander and the sophists in conjunction with the most illustrious of the Persians and Medes who were in attendance upon him, that this topic should be mentioned at a banquet. Anaxarchus commenced the discussion by saying that Alexander would much more justly be deemed a god than either Dionysus or Heracles, not only on account of the very numerous and mighty exploits which he had performed, but also because Dionysus was only a Theban, in no way related to Macedonians; and Heracles was an Argive, not at all related to them, except in regard to Alexander's pedigree; for he was a descendant of Heracles. He added that the Macedonians might with greater justice gratify their king with divine honors, for there was no doubt about this, that when he departed

²² G. C. Richards, "Proskynesis," *C.R.*, XLVIII (1934), pp. 168 ff. I quote (with permission) from Professor Nock's letter to me of October 27, 1941: "As for proskynesis, it certainly had in itself no necessary implications of deification."

²³ Arrian's account falls into two parts: 1) Anaxarchus' remarks and Callisthenes' reply; we do not know Arrian's source here, but it may be a good one (Callisthenes?). 2) The story of the drinking (see note 18 *supra*); here Arrian changes his source to the court chamberlain Chares, who was probably in a position to know what happened that night (though we also know that he was a deliberate liar).

from men they would honor him as a god. How much more just then would it be to reward him while alive, than after his death, when it would be no advantage to him to be honored."

We see from Arrian that Alexander desired homage as a divine personage. That he desired this homage from the Greeks and Macedonians is proved not only by the process of elimination—we have noted that proskynesis had no such significance for the Persians—but also by the fact that Alexander knew that the mere suggestion of proskynesis would produce an immediate reaction from the Greeks and Macedonians; inevitably, the ensuing discussion would be carried on by them and not by the Persians. To Greeks and Macedonians prostration meant worship; all of Greek history, as well as Callisthenes' speech, proves that. It was Alexander's hope that Persian coöperation in performing their traditional ceremony would help bring the Greeks and Macedonians into line, but, as we have seen, the idea had to be abandoned (temporarily for the Greeks, permanently, no doubt, for the Macedonians).

What was Alexander's motive? Although he had regularized his relation to the barbarian world by becoming the Great King of the former Persian Empire, there remained the problem of his relation to the Hellenic world. He proposed to solve this by becoming a god for a people who had many gods and who had raised men to the ranks of the gods not only in the legendary past but also in recent times (such as Lysander). His motive was purely political; neither now nor later did he consider himself a god, nor was he regarded as such by others. A clearer light is thrown on the matter, however, when we judge it in its chronological sequence.²⁴

Alexander crossed the Hindu Kush in the early spring of 329. Two years of guerrilla warfare in Bactria-Sogdiana were required before he broke the national resistance of eastern Iran. Fierce fighting, acts of treachery, and desert marches influenced, no doubt, his ideas of empire and his relation to it.²⁵ During the

²⁴ On certain chronological problems see my paper, "When did Alexander reach the Hindu Kush?" *A. J. P.*, LI (1930), pp. 22 ff.

²⁵ Alexander's conception of his own position developed constantly (a subject to which I shall return under my third point). At Ecbatana (spring, 330) Alexander dismissed his Greek allies, a certain sign of a new order. What this new order was to be he made clear, in part, by his adoption of Oriental dress: it was at once notice to the Greeks and

winter of 329-28 at Bactra Alexander first clearly expressed his plan of world conquest.²⁶ The national war, led by Spitamenes, forced Alexander to reconsider his relationship to the barbarians; it was not enough to give them administrative posts, they must have a stake in his success. In the summer of 328, therefore, he added Bactrians, Sogdians, and other Asiatics to the army, a significant and dramatic step in his development (Arrian, IV, 17, 3). Incidentally, it was these troops, combined with Macedonians, that pressed the Massagetae so hard that they cut off Spitamenes' head and sent it to Alexander. Early the next year Alexander married Roxane, the daughter of a powerful baron; it was a political marriage, by which he hoped to secure his power in eastern Iran. A month or so later, at Bactra, he ordered 30,000 native youths to be trained in Macedonian fashion. Plans for world conquest, the employment of Asiatic soldiers in the army, a political marriage, and the training of native youths in Macedonian fashion reveal the gigantic stature of Alexander. These were not the idle dreams of a visionary, for they had already been translated, in the large, into reality. They provide, too, the immediate background against which we must project the banquet at Bactra. A proposal for Alexander's deification seems, if not natural, at least not surprising. This was the device he intended to use in dealing with the Greek world.

Macedonians that they were not to occupy a privileged position in the empire and to the barbarians that he was their king, too. Consequently, Persians, Medes, Phoenicians, Egyptians—and as he proceeded east, other races—received important posts; see my paper, "Alexander the Great and the Barbarians" (in *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps* [Princeton, 1936], pp. 298 ff.). I take seriously (*Hellenic History* [New York, 1939], p. 248) Plutarch's statement (27, 6) that in Egypt Alexander had said that God is the common father of all men, but He makes the best ones peculiarly his own. It is hardly surprising that, at Opis in the year before his death, Alexander should have expressed himself on the brotherhood of man (Tarn, "Alexander the Great and the Unity of Mankind," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XIX).

²⁶ Arrian, IV, 15, 5; see my paper, "Alexander's Plans," *A. J. P.*, LXI (1940), pp. 402 ff. The only thing I would emphasize here is that my argument is not based on Alexander's *ὑπομνήματα* (Diodorus, XVIII, 4, 1), which are unhistorical as we have them. Alexander expressed himself on world conquest again, in 326, in India (Arrian, V, 26, 1).

3. Alexander's deification. There is no reference in the Alexander-historians to an edict by Alexander decreeing his deification,²⁷ but it is certain that Alexander issued such an edict, or that he encouraged the Greeks to issue one, or that they did so wholly on their own initiative.²⁸ The problem is not to decide which of these statements is true—the evidence is insufficient for that—but to discover Alexander's motive in ordering, or in permitting, his deification in the year before his death. If we have been correct in arguing that Alexander had seriously planned his deification at Bactra, we have the motive, and the purpose of this paper has been served. In both cases the motive was the same—to regularize his relation to the Greeks and to make possible an efficient administration of their land; frustrated at Bactra, Alexander now resolved to see the matter through.²⁹ It is customary,³⁰ however, to say that Alexander was led to

²⁷ Lacunae, however, occur at Arrian, VII, 12, Curtius, X, 1 and 2. Allusions in ancient literature to Alexander's deification: Plutarch, *Lycurgus*, 7; Valerius Maximus, *Sapienter dicta aut facta*, VII, 13; Aelian, *Var. Hist.*, II, 19; V, 12; Athenaeus, II, 22; VI, 58. Exiles decree: Diodorus, XVII, 109; XVIII, 8; Justin, XIII, 5. See Hogarth, *loc. cit.* (see note 1 *supra*).

²⁸ Ferguson, *loc. cit.* (see note 8 *supra*). Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 419): "The matter was probably brought before the [Corinthian] League states by his partisans in the several cities, but certainly the initiative came from him and not from the Greeks."

²⁹ It would be easier, now, after his victorious return from the East; the mass marriages at Susa show that his mind was still running along extraordinary lines (Arrian, VII, 4; Diodorus, XVII, 107; Justin, XII, 10; Plutarch, 70).

³⁰ Other explanations have been offered, of course. Reinmuth, *op. cit.*, p. 122 (see note 6 *supra*): "Alexander's deification was not a sanction of authority, but it was a recognition of what he *had* accomplished. Heracles had won his way to heaven by what he had done; thus Alexander was to become a god." Since much remained to be done, however, Alexander probably had a motive. Some scholars, though they miss the significance of the episode at Bactra, argue that Alexander now sought a general sanction of authority. Nock (*Syllabus of Gifford Lectures*, see note 8 *supra*) says that "Alexander sought deification, to be recognized as a god, probably mainly for status, when he wished to interfere directly in the affairs of his allies. As a god, he could sugar the pill of eminently unpopular measures." But with Nock, as generally with others, there is a connection with the exiles decree. I quote (with permission) from his letter to me of October 27, 1941: "I do not think that you can wholly ignore the coincidence in time of this measure and

self-deification in order to make legal his decree³¹ for the return of the exiles. Important as it was to bring stability to Greece, it does not seem likely that he would seek deification in order to solve an isolated problem. The best statement of this point of view is by Tarn,³² and we must briefly notice it: The recall of the exiles was "a breach of the Covenant of the League of Corinth, which forbade interference with the internal affairs of the constituent states."³³ . . . The Covenant bound Alexander of Macedon; it would not bind Alexander the god; the way therefore to exercise authority in the cities was to become a god. . . . There is nothing to show that he had any intention of doing away with Greek freedom; Craterus' instructions to supervise the freedom of the Hellenes show that the exiles decree was treated as an exceptional measure and that the League was to continue as before."

The Corinthian League was a convenient instrument for Alexander to use in his dealings with the Greeks, and no doubt he intended that it should continue in existence. But that he felt particularly bound by its Covenant at this time, or that his exiles decree represented an "exceptional" interference, is doubtful. As proof, we need only cite Alexander's actions, not at the end of his expedition when he was all-powerful, but at

the recall of the exiles." (Nock's *Syllabus* is a brief summary of his views; it has not been published, but a privately printed copy may be borrowed from the Harvard Library.) There is a similar connection in Ferguson's mind (see note 8 *supra*): "When the Greek cities had placed Alexander in their circles of deities he was at once free from all the treaty obligations accepted by him at the Congress of Corinth, and his first effort in his new capacity was to rid his realm of all its homeless and lawless men by requiring every city to receive back its exiles. What a gain to the world that this great problem could be finally attacked vigorously yet legally!" See, too, Nock, *J.H.S.*, XLVIII (1928), pp. 21 ff.; Wilcken, *Berl. Sitzb.*, 1938, pp. 298 ff.; Heuss, *Klio*, Beiheft XXXIX (1937), pp. 188 ff.

³¹ See note 27 *supra*.

³² *Loc. cit.* (see note 28 *supra*).

³³ Interference in a state was allowed, however, on the threat of social revolution; see Larsen, *Class. Phil.*, XX (1925), pp. 313 ff.; XXI (1926), pp. 52 ff. Thousands of homeless and determined men constituted, no doubt, a threat; very possibly, then, Alexander already had all the power he needed under the Covenant to deal with the exiles; in that event, any connection between the exiles decree and his deification vanishes.

the very beginning. It is well known that Alexander entered Asia Minor as King of Macedon and Commander-in-chief of the Corinthian League, but I do not think that the rapid development of his position, while still in Asia Minor, has been fully recognized. Whereas after the Granicus Alexander sent the Greek mercenaries of Darius to Macedonia in chains as traitors to the Corinthian League,³⁴ at Miletus he took Darius' Greek mercenaries into his service;³⁵ his conception of partnership with the League was already breaking down. Soon afterward he permitted Ada, the Carian queen, to adopt him as her son.³⁶ As he advanced through the non-Greek districts of Asia Minor he claimed the tribute which they had previously paid the Great King.³⁷ It seems probable, furthermore, that Alexander did not join the Greek cities of Asia Minor to the Corinthian League.³⁸ It is difficult to see what point there would have been in simultaneously disregarding the League and adding to its membership; he set up democracies in the Greek cities and in other ways interfered in their internal affairs;³⁹ the cities were probably united to him as "free and independent" allies by treaty, as they were to his successor, Antigonos; since the Successors were prone to follow Alexander's schemes in outline, and since Antigonos did not join the Greeks of Asia Minor to the League, it is probable that the precedent had been set by Alexander. Thus, by Issus, Alexander was not only King of Macedon, Commander-in-chief of the Corinthian League, and the adopted son of the native Ada, but he was also the "ally" of the Greek cities of Asia Minor and the Great King of the

³⁴ Arrian, I, 16, 6.

³⁵ Arrian, I, 19, 6.

³⁶ Arrian, I, 23, 8.

³⁷ For example, Arrian, I, 17, 1.

³⁸ Ehrenberg, *op. cit.*, chap. I (see note 12 *supra*); Tarn disagrees sharply in his review, *C. R.*, LII (1938), pp. 234 ff. See, too, E. Bickermann, "Alexandre le Grand et les villes d'Asie," *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, XLVII (1934), pp. 346 ff.; M. Rostovtzeff, *Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford, 1941), pp. 153 ff. Tarn again disagrees in his review, *J. R. S.*, XXXI (1941), pp. 165 ff.

³⁹ For example, Alexander had originally ordered that the Chian traitors should be tried by the council of the Corinthian League, but, when they were brought to him in Egypt, he sent them on his own authority to Elephantine under guard (Arrian, III, 2, 7).

native districts which he had conquered. Already unmindful of the Corinthian League, when it suited his purpose, and occupying different positions for the different sections of his empire, he did not need, on his return from the East after so many victories and experiences, to cast about in his mind for some extraordinary method whereby he might order the return of the exiles. The exiles decree was dramatic, to be sure, but it was merely the most recent of his plans for Greece. It had no connection, except in point of time, with his deification; the true significance of the latter has already been discussed.

Alexander's edict is perhaps better understood in the light of his differences with his men. Extending back over a long period,⁴⁰ discontent again came to the surface on the return to Susa (spring, 324), in spite of (or, perhaps, partially because of) the fact that the mass marriages had just been celebrated, and enthusiasm presumably was running high; the debts of the soldiers had just been paid by Alexander, too. The occasion was the arrival of the 30,000 native youths, who had been trained in Macedonian fashion; the Macedonians were offended, because they thought Alexander was contriving to free himself from future need of them.⁴¹ A short time later, at Opis on the Tigris, the Macedonians mutinied. It is the custom⁴² to accept Arrian's

⁴⁰ The chief previous instances of discontent are: The treason of Alexander, the Lyncestian (Arrian, I, 25, 1); at Tyre, when Parmenio urged Alexander to accept Darius' peace offer (Arrian, II, 25, 2); the plot of Philotas (Arrian, III, 26, 1); the opposition to his crossing the Jaxartes (see note 20 *supra*); dissatisfaction with his attitude toward the Macedonians, which resulted in a quarrel and the murder of Cleitus (Arrian, IV, 8, 1); the opposition to proskynesis (Arrian, IV, 11, 1); the conspiracy of the pages (Arrian, IV, 13, 1); the refusal of the army to advance beyond the Hyphasis in India (Arrian, V, 25, 2). Harpalus and other officials expected Alexander to perish in India and misbehaved during his absence.

⁴¹ Arrian, VII, 6, 2. Justin is silent (see note 44 *infra*). Diodorus (XVII, 109, 2) merely reports the arrival of the 30,000 youths and then, after a typical digression, mentions the dismissal of 10,000 veterans (referring, presumably, to the mutiny at Opis). Between two lacunae, Curtius (X, 2, 8) mentions the dismissal of the veterans and their mutiny. Plutarch (71, 1) gives Arrian's account, but adds, as if it had happened at Susa, an account of the mutiny. We may follow Arrian and recognize discontent at Susa and mutiny at Opis.

⁴² An exception is Hogarth, *loc. cit.* (see note 1 *supra*).

account: ⁴³ "When he arrived at Opis, Alexander collected the Macedonians and announced that he intended to discharge from the army those who were useless for military service either from age or from being maimed; and he said he would send them back to their own homes. He also promised to give those who went back as much extra reward as would make them special objects of envy to those at home and arouse in the other Macedonians the wish to share similar dangers and labors. Alexander said this, no doubt, for the purpose of pleasing the Macedonians; but on the contrary they were, not without reason, offended by the speech which he delivered, thinking that now they were despised by him and deemed to be quite useless for military service. . . . Therefore they could not remain silent and control themselves, but urged him to dismiss all of them from his army." Arrian's explanation of the mutiny does not ring true, for it is not likely that old and maimed soldiers would so resent honorable discharge as to lead the rest of the army to revolt. Justin has a different and, I believe, a better explanation: ⁴⁴ "Discharging some of the veterans, Alexander recruited the army with younger soldiers. But those that were retained, murmuring at the discharge of the older men, demanded that they themselves should be released likewise; desiring that their years, not of life, but of service, should be counted, and thinking it reasonable that those who had been enlisted in the service together, should together be set free from the service." If it is true that the temper of the Macedonians was such that the younger ones could insist, even to the point of mutiny, that they too be allowed to go home, then Alexander was faced by an impending crisis, which required all his skill. Perhaps we can see here a substantial reason for his seeking deification and an immediate solution of the problem of his relationship to the Greeks.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

⁴³ Arrian, VII, 8, 2. Tarn (*C. A. H.*, VI, p. 420): "Alexander was not trying to oust the Macedonians from their ancestral partnership with him, but they thought he was."

⁴⁴ Justin, XII, 11, 5 (Watson's translation). Justin places the mutiny in Babylonia but, in his compressed account, couples it with the mass marriages. It is not often that we would prefer Justin to Arrian, though he does occasionally touch a good source; see my paper, "Two Notes on the History of Alexander. 2. Justin," *A. J. P.*, LIII (1932), pp. 357 ff.

AMMIANUS' ACCOUNT OF GALLUS CAESAR.

Ammianus Marcellinus condemns Gallus as a bloodthirsty tyrant, and his opinion is unanimously followed by modern historians. Ammianus' account is by far the fullest extant, and this has obscured the fact that in ancient times there was a great diversity of attitude towards the Caesar. We find that the Eunomian Philostorgius is a warm admirer of the Arian Gallus; the pagan Zosimus considers him a wronged man and says not a word about his alleged misdeeds in Antioch. His half-brother Julian, despite a complete diversity of temperament, was his life-long friend and defended him with affection after his death. Among his friends Gallus also counted the leading Arian of the day, Aëtius, as well as the Bishop Theophilus ὁ Ἰνδός and Eudoxius, Bishop of Antioch and later of Constantinople (Philostorgius, III, 27; IV, 8). On the other hand, the orthodox Christian historians are almost unanimous in condemning him, but they may be suspected of prejudice against his Arianism just as Philostorgius is said to have favoured him because of it. Even so, we find St. Jerome remarking that Gallus was put to death *ob egregham indolem*. Occasionally we even find other orthodox Christians speaking well of him, but this is for purposes of contrast with his half-brother, the Apostate (e.g. St. John Chrysostom, *In S. Babylam contra Jul.*, etc., 14). His fervent Christianity is admitted on all sides (e.g. Sozomen, V, 19, 12; Gregory Naz., *Or.*, IV, 24; Theodoret, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 1).

With ancient opinion thus divided, it may be worth while examining Ammianus' account, without disregarding certain admissions which he himself makes, and bearing in mind the facts which we learn from our other authorities; we may also try to find reasons for his violent hatred of Gallus.

The first question to be decided is whether the beginning of Ammianus' extant narrative is also the beginning of his account of Gallus in Antioch, or whether he had already dealt to some extent with his activities there in one of the lost books. The brief review in XIV, 1, 1-2 of Gallus' elevation, his character, and the influence of his wife upon him seems to be an introduction to the whole episode. Indeed, the nature of the whole of the

first extant chapter, dealing as it does with generalities (apart from the Clementius incident) to be treated specifically later on, points to this view. It is strongly supported by Ammianus' reference to the *mulier vilis*, XIV, 7, 4, who was rewarded so ostentatiously by Constantina. As Valesius pointed out in his note *ad loc.*, this is the woman referred to by Zonaras, XIII, 8, as having betrayed to Gallus the conspiracy against his life engineered by Magnentius in 352. Clearly, Ammianus had not dealt with her before, and consequently he cannot have treated of Magnentius' conspiracy at all. Furthermore, it is very difficult to believe that Ammianus had already dealt with Gallus' military action against the Persians, although it was to meet their threats that he had been appointed Caesar. The casual and contemptuous expression in XIV, 7, 5, *Hierapolim profecturus, ut expeditioni specie tenus adesset*, without any reference back, supports this view; but a much stronger argument is provided by the chapter in which Ammianus deals with the Persians at this time, XIV, 3. For here he tells of the threat which Constantius sought to meet by appointing a second ruler in the East, but feebly explains away its failure by asserting that Nohodares' attack collapsed owing to the treachery of some of his soldiers who betrayed his first objective to the Romans, 3, 4. At most, this would have kept him away from Batnae but need not have hindered the attack on Mesopotamia which he had been ordered to undertake, 3, 1. Actually we hear from other sources that Nohodares had more solid reasons for retiring. For Gallus, basing himself on Hierapolis,¹ made what was at least a highly successful demonstration against him. Philostorgius, III, 28, is very enthusiastic in his praise of Gallus' military capacity,² while Zonaras, XIII, 9, speaks of an *εὐτύχημα* after which Gallus returned to Antioch. From another source (Joannes Monachus, *S. Artemii Passio*, 12, in Mai's *Spicilegium Romanum*, IV, pp. 348 ff.) we actually hear that the Persians stopped their

¹ So much we may derive from the phrase of Ammianus quoted *supra*, XIV, 7, 5. Cf. Julian, *Ep.* 98, Bidez.

² Γάλλου κατὰ Περσῶν εἰς τὸ κράτιστον ἀνδραγαθήσαντος εἰς φθόνον οἱ ταῖς διαβολαῖς χαίροντες ἀναφλέγουσι τὸν βασιλέα· καὶ τοῦ Περσικοῦ πολέμου ταῖς τοῦ Καίσαρος ἀριστείαις πεπανμένον, κτλ. He says that Constantius wished τὴν ἐπ' ἀνδρεία καὶ τῇ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμελείᾳ δόξαν αὐτοῦ (Γάλλου) κατασμικρύνειν.

operations on hearing that Gallus was young and θερμουργὸς εἰς τὰ ἔργα.³

It is not clear then what Ammianus could have dealt with if he treated of Gallus in Antioch before the opening of Book XIV, so that we may assume with relative safety that we have this section of the History complete. Here at the very beginning of our enquiry, then, we find him suppressing information which was to Gallus' credit. We will come to the same conclusion if we examine Gallus' other campaigns.

Ammianus, XIV, 2, gives a long account of the inroads of the Isaurians. Gallus must have been responsible for the general direction of this difficult campaign, although the historian does not mention him till the very end, 2, 20, and then in rather slighting terms. But, if there was any delay on his part in sending help to Seleuceia, the temporary reverse was definitely due to the excessive caution of Castricius, who fell back on the city against the wishes of his troops; yet he commanded a veteran force and cannot have been in any great danger. A vigorous commander would have required no assistance from the Caesar, who may have delayed sending help in the expectation that an energetic sally would break up the siege.

Finally, Ammianus completely omits mention of the rising of the Jews in Diocaesarea. Gallus promptly sent troops to crush this and had Diocaesarea razed,⁴ and, according to St. Jerome, Tiberias and Diospolis as well.

With regard to Gallus' military qualities, then, Ammianus gives us two slighting references and conceals the fact that the Caesar, despite his complete inexperience, could act with energy and effectiveness when the occasion demanded.

Let us deal now with the historian's narrative. As stated

³ The state of the Eastern frontier is described thus in our authorities: Libanius, II, p. 407 F., Περσῶν καθ' ἕκαστον ἔτος ἀεὶ τι παρασπωμένων καὶ τὰ αὐτῶν μείζω ποιούντων κτλ., cf. p. 326; Philostorgius, III, 25, τὸ Περσικὸν ἀκούσας (Constantius) κατὰ τῆς ἐώς βαρυτέρα χειρὶ κινεῖσθαι. Zonaras, XIII, 8, ὁ Σαπώρης ἀδείας δραξάμενος τὰ περὶ ἑω ἐπόρθησε, καὶ λείαν λαβών. καὶ δορυαλώτους πολλοὺς ἐπανάευσεν. Hence Julian, *Or.*, I, 28 D; II, 66 D, should not lead us to believe that the Persian frontier was very quiet and Gallus' campaign a trifle; the passages are highly rhetorical.

⁴ Socrates, II, 32; Sozomen, IV, 7, 5; Cedrenus, in Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, CXXI, col. 569.

above, his first chapter treats only of generalities, apart from the incident of Clematius, and seems to be an introduction to what follows. Despite much powerful rhetoric the charges brought against Gallus are very few. First he accuses him of overstepping the authority given to him and of a general harshness in his behaviour, *ultra terminos potestatis delatae procurrens, asperitate nimia cuncta foedabat*, 1, 1. We may concede the second point, but Ammianus does not make it at all clear what he means by this accusation of unconstitutional activity. As we shall see later, he cannot be referring to any intention to challenge Constantius. He must therefore be referring to the lynchings which took place with Gallus' connivance. The rights and wrongs of these are dealt with below. Secondly, Gallus is accused of instituting a widespread system of espionage (1, 2, 6, 9) which greatly disturbed the population, or at any rate the upper classes,⁵ and there is no reason to doubt this. But we shall see later that certain sections of the upper classes were so untrustworthy that it was necessary to keep them under close observation. Ammianus also asserts that Gallus himself roamed through the streets at night with a few armed attendants asking those whom they met what they thought of the Caesar. This was done *multis gementibus*, as the historian vaguely puts it. At most he means that those who gave unfavourable replies were manhandled. Had any been killed or seriously injured, he would have been only too glad to be more explicit.⁶

After Clematius' death, he says that some were executed, some exiled, and the goods of others were confiscated, 1, 4. This refers forward. The case of Clematius is rather mysterious, 1, 3. Ammianus could not discover the reason for his execution without trial, but he gives a rumour (*ut ferebatur*) which is obviously mythological. Libanius considers that he was wrongly put to death (*Ep.*, 693 F.). At any rate, it was Constantina who had him killed, and we do not hear that Honoratus, the *Comes*

⁵ It is probably to this that Libanius refers in *Ep.* 391 (X, p. 386) and in p. 130, F.

⁶ 1, 9. But the whole story may well be a myth. Similar tales are told of many absolute monarchs, e.g. Gallienus here, Nero in Tacitus, *Ann.*, XIII, 25, to say nothing of Haroun al Raschid. In the present passage note the contradiction between *novo exemplo* and *quod Romae . . . temptasse aliquando dicitur Gallienus*.

Orientis, who had to carry out the execution, raised any objection to it, although he was not afraid to oppose Gallus on such matters when his conscience or interests demanded it (cf. XIV, 7, 2).

The chapter concludes with a note on the behaviour of Thalassius, the Praetorian Prefect, in relation to Gallus, and finishes with the words *velut contumaciae quoddam vexillum altius erigens, sine respectu salutis alienae aut suae, ad vertenda opposita* (Bentley, *supposita*, V), *instar rapidi fluminis, irrevocabili impetu ferebatur*. Obviously this is merely rhetoric, a literary trick to leave a dark impression on our minds of Gallus' misdeeds, which in fact have been specified in only one instance, that of Clematius. When Ammianus resumes his narrative of Gallus six chapters later, he immediately strikes this same note again. We may observe that, at the end of each of the three chapters in which he deals with Gallus in Antioch (1, 7, 9), Ammianus places a sweeping sentence of condemnation with literary rather than historical effect in each case (see further p. 315 *infra*).

In XIV, 7, 2 and 5 ff., we have a very misleading account of Gallus' reaction to the threatened famine at Antioch. He ordered the leaders of the Senate to be put to death, says the historian, because they insolently⁷ opposed a general lowering of prices which Gallus recommended when the famine was imminent; but Honoratus, the *Comes Orientis*, begged them off with great resolution. At this point Ammianus interposes two matters which are absolutely irrelevant to the famine, 7, 3-4, and resumes in § 5 as if he were dealing with quite a different shortage. Gallus did not meet it, he says, as other princes were in the habit of doing, by a distribution of stores or by bringing supplies from the surrounding provinces, but put the blame on Theophilus, governor of Syria, and delivered him up to the multitude who tore him to pieces,⁸ and burnt the house of Eubulus, a wealthy man.⁹ It is to be noted that Gallus is not directly blamed for the actual killing of Theophilus: there seems to have been some kind of lynching, instigated to a certain extent by him.

⁷ *Gravius rationabili responderunt*.

⁸ Theophilus was killed only later *cum ingravesceret penuria com-meatuum*; in whose hands was he in the meantime?

⁹ Julian, *Misop.*, 370 C, exaggerates in saying that they set fire to the houses τῶν δυνατῶν. Cf. Libanius, *Or.*, I, 103. Eubulus was doubtless the ringleader in engineering the famine.

Now, this account omits certain very relevant facts. In the first place, the Antiochene Senate was composed of rich landowners whose estates in the neighbourhood largely furnished the food supply of the city.¹⁰ In the middle of the fourth century these landowners manipulated the prices of food in Antioch in a most outrageous manner, strongly reminiscent of modern capitalistic methods; thus, they were not above dumping grain into the Orontes in a time of shortage when they could not obtain what they considered a fair price.¹¹ Their rascality was so extreme that, when Julian in a time of shortage imported grain, the surprising result was that the shortage became even more acute. The incident may be briefly summarised here as it throws a certain light on Gallus' circumstances. Julian brought the grain from the surrounding provinces and from Egypt at the expense of the Treasury and was able to sell it at a price one third less than that of the Senatorial landowners. The latter were unable to compete and consequently bought up this imported grain at the low price fixed by Julian and at the same time secretly exported to the neighbouring provinces the grain which they had originally offered at their exorbitant rate on the Antiochene market. Thus, when they had bought up Julian's imported grain, there was an even greater shortage than before, for it turned out that they had secretly exported more than Julian had imported. Prices—and profits—were thus higher than ever. Julian threatened the principal Senators with prison but Libanius showed that this would cure nothing.

This was the type of rascal that Gallus had to deal with. Clearly, when his recommendation to the landowners to lower their prices was disobeyed, he saw a less expensive method of ending the shortage than Julian, which Julian was not very far from imitating;¹² and we read that when Theophilus was done to death, *in unius exitio quisque imaginem periculi sui considerans, documento recenti similia formidabat*, XIV, 7, 6, doubtless with favourable results on the price of food. Constantius sent out a commissioner, Musonianus, to inquire into Theophilus'

¹⁰ E. S. Bouchier, *A Short History of Antioch*, p. 154.

¹¹ P. Allard, *Julien l'Apostat*, III, pp. 44 ff., with authorities. That conditions in Gallus' time were identical with those of nine years later is evident from Julian, *Misop.*, 370 C.

¹² *Galli similis fratris, licet incruentus*, XXII, 14, 2.

death, but gave him instructions to deal with the situation mildly—proof that even the central government took a lenient view of the affair.¹³ Julian regretted the outrage, but felt that the anger of the populace against the Senate was justified,¹⁴ and with this judgment we may agree. Observe that Constantius heard of this affair from Thalassius, a circumstance of which we shall see the significance below. Ammianus, while admitting the insolence of the Senate, asserts that Theophilus was innocent, § 8. This is highly improbable in face of Julian's testimony, Gallus' accusation, and the mob's enthusiasm in killing him, to say nothing of Constantius' moderation. Ammianus may have inserted *insontem* for the sake of the antithesis with Serenianus.

We have seen that Ammianus inserted two paragraphs into his account of the famine which were unconnected with it. In the first of these, 7, 3, he condemns Gallus for delighting in watching the bloody sport of boxing (see Valesius' note *ad loc.*). Julian, *Misop.*, 340 A, says rather smugly that, apart from himself, all his family including Gallus delighted in attending horse-races. Seeck¹⁵ takes this as evidence of Gallus' cruel nature; but obviously it affects the cruelty—if that is the right word—of the times rather than of any individual.

In the second of these paragraphs, 7, 4, Ammianus is strangely brief on the subject of the old woman who betrayed the conspiracy which Magnentius organised in order to distract Constantius in the East as well as in the West. He says that this woman *accenderat . . . incitatum propositum ad nocendum*. This may simply mean that she thus enabled him to put the conspirators to death,¹⁶ or it may mean that this conspiracy increased the suspicions and the personal harshness of the Caesar.¹⁷

¹³ Ammianus, XV, 13, 2, supplemented and corrected by Libanius, *Or.*, XIX, 47, who, it should be noted, considered Theophilus a good governor, but says nothing of his guilt or innocence in this connection. It is not easy to see who were the *auctores diri facinoris* of XV, 13, 2; but the passage at least shows that Gallus had some support even in the upper classes. Aëtius was strongly on Gallus' side, Gregory of Nyssa, Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, XLV, col. 264.

¹⁴ *Misop.*, 370 C, ὡν ὀργιζόμενος δικαίως ἔπραξεν οὐκέτι μετρίως.

¹⁵ *R.-E.*, s. v. "Constantius" (5), col. 1095.

¹⁶ Zonaras, XIII, 8.

¹⁷ Compare Seeck, *loc. cit.*, col. 1096.

Ammianus' next charge against Gallus is that he acquitted a man called Serenianus, who was, he says, an inefficient soldier; he was tried on charges of practising magic and asking an oracle if he would become Emperor, and Gallus dismissed the case. He may well have repented the judgment, for Constantius afterwards employed Serenianus in a high position, namely as supervisor of the Caesar's execution. The Emperor Valens so esteemed his military capacity that he recalled him from his retirement in 364 and appointed him *Comes Domesticorum*. His energetic defence of Cyzicus in 365-6 (XXVI, 8, 7 ff.) goes far to refute Ammianus' charge of military inefficiency. In spite of what he thought himself, the historian admits that the public agreed with Gallus' decision.¹⁸

We now come to the death of the impossible Domitianus¹⁹ for downright treason, and of the quaestor Montius for unparadonable interference with the troops.²⁰ Both of them richly deserved some such fate. The lynchings, however, were not incited by Gallus, but by a certain Luscus, *curator urbis*, who was shortly afterwards put to death for his part in this affair, not impossibly by Gallus, XIV, 7, 17. Gallus, however, was not sorry to see the end of both of them.²¹ The treachery was a family affair. On Domitianus' orders, his son-in-law Apollinaris had in the meantime been tampering with the troops, but, when he learned what had happened to his father-in-law, he fled to Constantinople, where he was arrested and brought back to Antioch, XIV, 7, 19. This young man's father, of the same name, who was governor of Phoenicia, also fell under suspicion of complicity in the treason and was arrested with "many others," doubtless his accomplices, *ibid.*, 20.

¹⁸ XIV, 7, 8. See the suggestion on Serenianus, *infra*, note 33.

¹⁹ Also condemned by Philostorgius, III, 28; Zonaras, XIII, 9. Their testimony with that of Ammianus (note especially 7, 10: *abditus multa in eius moliebatur exitium*) far outweighs Joannes Monachus, *loc. cit.*, 13, who calls him and Montius *ἄνδρας ἐν ἀξιώματι διαπρέψαντας, καὶ παντὸς κέρδους καὶ λήματος εὐρεθέντας ὑψηλοτέρους*.

²⁰ Ammianus, XIV, 7, 12, characterises him rather unfavourably, but the text is corrupt. Philostorgius, III, 28, gives a somewhat different account, but no more creditable to Montius.

²¹ XIV, 7, 13 f.; Philostorgius, III, 28: *συνεπιψηφίζοντος καὶ τοῦ Γάλλου*; Constantina seems to have had a hand in it, Philostorgius, *loc. cit.*

Ammianus rounds off this chapter with a powerful piece of rhetoric indicating that innocent and guilty—he admits that some were guilty—were alike punished without a fair trial. Yet, when he resumes his narrative in chap. 9, again after speciously interposing a chapter, we learn that no less a person than Ursicinus was recalled from Nisibis to try the suspected. Finding that he was not given a free hand, Ursicinus stooped to a secret protest to Constantius over Gallus' head. I hope to show elsewhere that Ursicinus was a not wholly admirable character; he was suspected by some of aspiring to the throne himself.

The first to be tried were Epigonus, a philosopher from Cilicia, and Eusebius, a violent orator from Edessa.²² These two had been arrested by mistake in connection with Montius and were no doubt put to death unjustly, for little importance can be attached to Epigonus' confession under torture. In connection with the elder Apollinaris, a certain Maras, *diaconus, ut appellat Christiani*, was tried and tortured, but as he refused to admit anything he was set free. The two Apollinares were put to death *post multorum clades*. These "many" are doubtless to be equated with the *alii multi*, used of the elder Apollinaris' accomplices in XIV, 7, 19. We may perhaps assume that some innocent men were destroyed among them.²³

It is clear that Gallus had unearthed a widespread conspiracy²⁴ headed by the members of one family, Domitianus and the Apollinares. Montius was in active sympathy with it, for he had already arranged with the *tribuni fabricarum* to have weapons manufactured to arm the conspirators, XIV, 7, 18,—the *adminicula futurae molitioni* (Lindembrog, *militioni*, V), as Ammianus puts it elsewhere. Clearly, the chances of the con-

²² For him see Ammianus, XIV, 7, 18 and 9, 4 ff.; Suidas, s. v. W. Schmid, *R.-E.*, VI, col. 1445, has confused him with the Eusebius who taught Julian; but the latter came from Myndus in Caria, Eunapius, *V. S.*, p. 428, Loeb translation by Wright.

²³ Observe that *periere complures* in XIV, 9, 3, refers forward, as *igitur* at the beginning of 4 shows; *plures* is to be specified in the succeeding narrative. It is extremely remarkable that Gregory of Nyssa, who is not at all favourably disposed towards Gallus, mentions only exile as a punishment and says nothing of execution, Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, XLV, col. 257.

²⁴ That it was widespread is shown by *ex diversis civitatibus*, XIV, 7, 20, and the exaggerated *ubique . . . per orientales provincias*, *ibid.*, 21.

spirators were reduced to nothing by their failure with Gallus' troops.

In this connection we should explicitly emphasise what is implicit in Ammianus' narrative, namely that Gallus was highly popular with the rank and file of the army. In spite of the fact that Magnentius' agent met with some success in tampering with the common soldiers, XIV, 7, 4, it is clear that Constantius was seriously alarmed at the possibility of a military rising in favour of Gallus and he had little hope of achieving his aim of recalling him without using force.²⁵ His first step against the Caesar was gradually to withdraw some of the troops under his command, XIV, 7, 9. When Gallus reached Constantinople on his last journey, Constantius thought it prudent to remove all troops from the route he was to take thereafter. Yet when he arrived at Hadrianopolis, certain Thebaean legions in the neighbourhood were willing to rise in his favour, but, owing to Constantius' precautions, the Caesar could not establish contact with them, XIV, 11, 13-15. When Barbatio²⁶ stripped him of his imperial insignia at Petovio, he was commanding soldiers whom he had had to pick especially for their indebtedness to Constantius and for their characters which admitted of neither bribes nor pity, *ibid.*, 19. Again, when Gallus' friends and supporters in the East were being punished by Constantius, we read that among them were *militarium catervae*, XV, 3, 1. Before the period of his fall, the spontaneity with which the troops disregarded Montius and lynched him and Domitianus is significant of the Caesar's popularity among them.

In this connection we must note the willingness of the old woman who lived beside the Orontes in a hovel to inform on Magnentius' conspirators, Zonaras, XIII, 8. The reason for this popularity is not far to seek. Gallus' sympathy with the poorer classes is clearly illustrated by his attitude during the threatened famine at Antioch, when he sided so strongly with them against the machinations of the landowning Senators.

We have now to explain Ammianus' distaste for Gallus and the reasons for his misrepresentation of him. In the first place, it must be remembered that Ammianus was extremely class

²⁵ XV, 1, 2: *rem insperatam et arduam*.

²⁶ Afterwards generally hated for his treachery to Gallus under whom he had commanded the *Protectores Domestici*, XVIII, 3, 6.

conscious, as I have tried to show elsewhere.²⁷ He cannot, therefore, have been attracted by Gallus' sympathy for the *turba imae sortis et paupertinae*. (We have seen how his friend Libanius strongly supported the landowners under Julian.)

Secondly, there is no denying that Gallus' personal behaviour was harsh and repellent.²⁸ It was made all the more so by his pitiless upbringing and cannot have been improved by the fact that Constantius looked on him with suspicion from the moment he elevated him to the rank of Caesar (Julian, *op. cit.*, 272 A), and appears to have appointed some of the officials who were to serve under him (Joannes Monachus, *op. cit.*, 12). This would be natural enough in view of Gallus' inexperience but may well have been resented—and not without reason if Thalassius and Barbatio are typical examples. Zosimus, II, 45, is actually inclined to believe that Constantius made him Caesar in the hope that he would meet his death at the hands of the Persians. However that may be, Ammianus undoubtedly met him during the trials conducted by Ursicinus, so that he, and in any case his informants, will have had a strong personal dislike for the Caesar which tended to colour their interpretation of events. A clear case of Ammianus' dependence upon the prejudice of his informants is afforded by XIV, 11, 8. After Ammianus had left Antioch (note the first person in § 5), he had to rely on informants for an account of subsequent events there.²⁹ Hence he says in XIV, 11, 8, on their authority, that Gallus definitely aimed at the throne, although he had given this simply as a rumour when describing his own general impression of Gallus' reign, XIV, 1, 1. This rumour also contradicts Gallus' fear of causing a civil war reported by Philostorgius and Joannes Monachus. Furthermore, if Heraeus' emendation *clam* is correct in XIV, 11, 8, how did the informants find out what Gallus deliberated on in secrecy? The truth of the matter is given by Zonaras, XIII, 9, who says that Constantius was afraid that *those opposed by Gallus* would rebel, not Gallus himself, *δείσας οὖν ὁ Κωνσταντίος μὴ, εἰ κινηθεῖεν εἰς ἀποστασίαν οἱ ὑπ' ἐκείνου (Γάλλου) κακούμενοι, ἐμφυλίου πολέμου δεήσῃ αὐτῷ*.

²⁷ See *Greece and Rome*, XI (1942), pp. 130-134.

²⁸ XIV, 11, 3; Julian, *Ep. ad Ath.*, 271 D; John of Antioch, frag. 174, in *F. H. G.*, IV, 604; Eutropius, X, 13; etc.

²⁹ See "The Historical Method of Ammianus Marcellinus," *Hermathena*, LIX (1942), pp. 44-66.

Thirdly, Ursicinus had definitely a violent hatred of Gallus, despite the honour the latter did him in summoning him from Nisibis to take charge of the trials. We do not know the reason for this attitude on Ursicinus' part. He was commanding in Nisibis when Gallus was appointed Caesar; it may be that he felt himself equal to the task of repelling the Persian menace and resented the appointment of Gallus over his head. In similar circumstances in 359, he and Ammianus were highly indignant at his replacement by Sabinianus, XVIII, 6, 1 ff. It may have been that he wanted a freer hand with the trials than Gallus was willing to give him. It may have been both. At any rate, his resentment was very strong and left its mark on his admirer Ammianus.

Finally, we must remember that Constantius was consistently misinformed about Gallus. The Praetorian Prefect Thalassius was quick to understand the Caesar's fiery temperament. Consequently he opposed and provoked him into rash and ill-considered acts and then openly informed on him to Constantius, XIV, 1, 10. Thalassius was esteemed very highly indeed by Constantius until his death in 354.³⁰ We are explicitly told that Constantius learned of the affair of the Antiochene Senate from his distorted reports, XIV, 7, 9. For his conduct to Gallus, Julian later made attacks on his family which Libanius deplored.³¹ We are also told that Domitianus sent home reports about Gallus which were deliberately inaccurate and misleading, XIV, 7, 9. The ancient authorities are almost unanimous in saying that Constantius listened to a barrage of tendentious criticism of Gallus by the eunuch Eusebius and his party.³² The effect of all this on the historical tradition cannot be accurately estimated, but several of Ammianus' informants must have been strongly influenced by Constantius' propaganda thus vitiated, and so have reinforced the historian's prejudice against the Caesar.

³⁰ XIV, 7, 9. See e. g. Zosimus, II, 48, 5.

³¹ XXII, 9, 16; Libanius, *Ep.*, XI, 410, 423, 447 F. The family was on intimate terms with Musonianus, *idem*, frag. 20 (XI, 622 F.).

³² Zosimus, II, 55 with the wrong names; Philostorgius, III, 28 *init.* and especially IV, 1; Joannes Monachus, 15. Julian put Eusebius to death on this account, Sozomen, V, 5, 9. At a later date Barbatio also was not above sending false reports to Constantius, XVI, 11, 7. Cf. XIV, 11, 24 and XVIII, 3, 6.

These were the influences to which Ammianus was exposed and which tended to darken his interpretation of Gallus' life. Thus it was that he construed such matters as Gallus' defence against conspiracy as the murders of a capricious tyrant and used all his powers of rhetoric to show that the Caesar's espionage among the untrustworthy upper classes constituted a reign of terror for Antioch as a whole and to some extent for all the Eastern provinces. Yet, on examining his narrative, what do we actually find? Epigonus and Eusebius were undoubtedly put to death unjustly, and possibly also Clematius, although his case is obscure. Domitianus, Montius, and Theophilus were lynched with Gallus' connivance, and they certainly earned some such fate. The Apollinares and their accomplices were treated as it is customary to treat those who indulge in high treason, but innocent men may have been executed among the subordinate conspirators. The leaders of the oppressive Senate were threatened with death but reprieved—an instance of Gallus' hasty nature also illustrated by the fortunes of Aëtius.³³ Now, the execution of three innocent men (one of them a doubtful case), and possibly a few more, and a considerable number of flagrant conspirators in a reign of some three years was no bad record for those iron times. On the other hand, the Caesar's voluntary journey to what he knew would be his death in preference to causing a civil war contrasts favourably with Julian's action in similar circumstances and was distinctly rare, if not unique, in an age when men amiably considered that Might was Right.

Gallus was regretted by many after his death, XV, 3, 1; XVIII, 3, 6. Indeed, there is a strong ancient tradition that Constantius revised his opinion of him and sent a reprieve which was held up by Eusebius and his agents until the Caesar had been executed.³⁴ This tradition is borne out by the fact that Gallus' statues were not thrown down nor were his inscriptions erased after his death (Seeck, *loc. cit.*, col. 1099). It is certain that he was fully rehabilitated by the time Julian wrote his

³³ Philostorgius, III, 24; but Sozomen, III, 15, 8, is much more favourable to Gallus. We read that Serenianus was employed in Phoenicia, XIV, 7, 7. He must have known the elder Apollinaris who was governor there. Was he implicated in the conspiracy? If so, Gallus was not indiscriminate in executing traitors.

³⁴ Philostorgius, IV, 1; Zonaras, XIII, 9; Joannes Monachus, 15.

Letter to the Athenians, cf. 271 A. Had Ammianus been able to obtain the facts free from propaganda and dissociate the Caesar's actions from his personal arrogance, he might have revised his opinion too.³⁵

To sum up, we may fairly bring the following charges against Ammianus' account of Gallus: 1) He has not brought out sufficiently the guilt of the chief men done to death under Gallus, although to some extent he indicates it incidentally.³⁶ 2) He has obscured Gallus' popularity with the lower classes. 3) He has altogether suppressed Gallus' capabilities as a military leader. 4) Ammianus omits the Jewish rebellion, the suppression of Magnentius' conspiracy, Constantius' change of heart after Gallus' death, the Caesar's strong Christianity, and his pious attitude to the remains of the popular St. Babylas; he all but omits the fact that Gallus had a wide following, nor do we hear from him that he counted among his friends many men who were above reproach and who would not have tolerated intimacy with a foul and reckless tyrant. 5) The historian has split up his narrative of Gallus in Antioch into three parts.³⁷ The first is a fine piece of rhetoric, but its sweeping charges are not at all specific and are not adequately supported by the ensuing account. The second, chap. 7, ends with another sweeping charge which is utterly contradicted at the beginning of the third. The third, chap. 9, ends with yet another violent phrase telling how Gallus, *ut leo cadaveribus pastus, multa huius modi scrutabatur*. The difference in intensity between the simile and the verb illustrates the historian's rhetorical methods. All this is cunning writing but not impartial history.

E. A. THOMPSON.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, SWANSEA.

³⁵ Perhaps indeed he did revise it in XXI, 1, 2: *quem (Gallum) inertia mixtaeque periuriis fraudes prodidere quorundam*.

³⁶ Libanius, II, pp. 246 f., says that Gallus obtained letters proving a conspiracy against himself, but that he was never allowed to produce them. So Julian, *Ep. ad Ath.*, 272 C.

³⁷ So, on a smaller scale, he has divided the account of the famine at Antioch into two.

THE ΔΙΚΗ ΒΑΑΒΗΣ IN DEMOSTHENES, OR., LV.

The Demosthenic oration against Callicles was delivered by the son of a certain Tisias in defense against a *dike blabes* (§ 20) brought by Callicles on the ground that he had suffered damage because the defendant had walled off a watercourse, thereby causing an inundation on the plaintiff's land. The parties owned neighboring estates on the slope of a mountain range, their plots being separated from each other by a public road running down the slope. To keep water from overflowing his property the defendant maintained a wall around his plot. Its purpose was, so he contends, to make the water run down the road, and he claims that he was only following a commonly accepted custom. One day, however, a torrent which had formed after a heavy downpour swept over the estate of the plaintiff, inflicting some losses. The plaintiff accused the defendant's wall of being the cause of the flood on his land; a controversy arose and finally developed into the present lawsuit, a close analysis of which will shed some new light on that well-known but still obscure action called *dike blabes* in the sources of Athenian law.

Our problem arises from the fact that the defendant characterizes the lawsuit as a *dike atimetos*, i. e., a *dike* in which judgment, if given for the plaintiff, is not based on a valuation of the actual damage but on a sum fixed beforehand and beyond the control of the court. In this case the penalty amounted to 1000 drachmas. Since in all the other known cases of *dike blabes*, with the exception of the breach of a contract providing in advance for a fixed penalty, judgment was based on the estimated value of the damage sustained by the plaintiff, the exclusion of the valuation in favor of a legally fixed penalty in the action for damages caused by water is surprising.

The attempt has indeed been made¹ to get rid of the problem by explaining the exclusion of a valuation as a consequence of

¹ A. W. Heffter, *Die athenäische Gerichtsverfassung* (Cologne, 1822), p. 118, note; T. Thalheim, *Zu den griechischen Rechtsalterthümern* (Schneidemühl, 1892), pp. 6 f.; J. H. Lipsius, *Das attische Recht und Rechtsverfahren* (Leipzig, 1905-15), p. 662, n. 97; J. Partsch, *Arch. Pap.*, VI (1913), p. 51.

the particular circumstances of this case. The trial before the popular court, in which the speech was delivered, had been preceded by at least ² two awards in default given against the defendant by public arbitrators, one of them in favor of the plaintiff himself, and the other in favor of his brother who, according to the speaker (§ 2), had been instigated by Callicles to bring suit. The close relationship of the two arbitration cases with each other and with the present trial is obvious, and the assumption that the latter followed upon the quashing of either the first award or possibly both of them seems to be safe enough to form the basis of an interpretation of the oration.³ Consequently, it is assumed that the present trial no longer offered an opportunity for a valuation, which is supposed to have been made previously by the arbitrator between Callicles and the defendant. The popular court, in the opinion of those who hold this view, was in a position only to uphold or abolish the arbitrator's award in its totality but not to modify it.

The right to quash a judgment in default, however, confined to rather narrow conditions and to a limited period, was to provide for the defaulting party a chance to have the lawsuit started all over again, including, of course, the procedure of valuation if there was any involved. This not only follows from abstract legal reasoning but also from the technical phrase employed to express the quashing of an award in default: τὴν μὴ οὖσαν ἀντιλαχεῖν,⁴ and it is clearly stated by Pollux, *Onom.*, VIII, 60: καὶ ἡ ἐρήμῃ ἐλύετο ὡς ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ διατητήν.⁵ Hence,

² I omit for the moment the action against the slave, Callarus, referred to in § 31. That this action was separate from those mentioned in § 2 has been justly stated by Lipsius, *op. cit.*, p. 796, n. 21. Witness ἐρέραν (without an article!) in § 31.

³ Denied by M. H. E. Meier-G. F. Schömann-J. H. Lipsius, *Der attische Prozess* (Berlin, 1883-87), p. 224, n. 66, and L. Beauchet, *Histoire du droit civil de la République Athénienne* (Paris, 1897), IV, p. 402, n. 2.

⁴ Evidence cited by Lipsius, *Att. Recht*, p. 229, n. 39, p. 961, n. 18.

⁵ Modern authors, including Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 961 f., and Partsch, *Griechisches Bürgerschaftsrecht*, I (Leipzig, 1909), p. 299, agree on this point; and I cannot see how Lipsius and Partsch reconciled their general view with their interpretation of our speech. In addition see: A. Steinwenter, *Die Streitbeendigung durch Urteil, Schiedsspruch und Vergleich nach griechischem Rechte* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, VIII [Munich, 1925]), p. 65; H. C. Harrell, *Public Arbitration in Athenian Law* (University of Missouri Studies, XI, 1 [1936]), pp. 33 f.

the theory, advanced by a number of earlier students,⁶ that we are faced with a genuine *dike atimetos* aimed at inflicting upon the defendant a penalty fixed by law at 1000 drachmas, and not leaving room for any valuation, seems to be preferable. As a matter of fact, the plural in § 18: ὅπου γὰρ ἀτιμήτους φεύγω δίκας, indicates that the defendant has in mind the former actions of his opponents, as well as the present trial, and that the awards in default also were handed down in *dikai atimetoî*.⁷ In the light of the familiar habit of Attic forensic orators to dwell on the mendacity of their opponents, it is also significant that the speaker does not accuse the plaintiff of having deceived the arbitrator who is supposed to have made the valuation, although he points out (§§ 23-25, 28) that the actual damage is quite negligible and out of proportion to the penalty of 1000 drachmas.

Therefore the reason why our suit was a *dike atimetos* has to be sought in the legal principles which formed its background. *Lex. Seguer.*, p. 251, 3: ἐνθεσμος βλάβη· ἡ ἐν τοῖς νόμοις ὠρισμένη, which used to be cited, neither proves nor explains anything. Fortunately, however, the speech itself offers a solution.

It is found in a casual but none the less conclusive remark. More than once (§§ 1-2, 34) the speaker asserts that the action is only one of several schemes tried by Callicles for the purpose of getting hold of the defendant's estate. This, of course, is no more than an oratorical trick calculated to stir up favorable feeling among the judges. It receives color, however, from what we read in § 32: καὶ ζητοῦσι καὶ διαιτητὴν ὅστις αὐτοῖς τὰ χωρία προσκαταγνώσεται, καὶ διαλύσεις τοιαύτας ἐξ ὧν τὰ χωρὶ ἐξουσιν. It is true that this sentence does not immediately refer to the lawsuit in which our speech was delivered; the defendant here has in mind the action against his slave, Callarus. But this action was a duplicate of the present suit, as is evident from § 31: καὶ νῦν αὐτὸς ἐρήμην καταδεδίχηται τοιαύτην ἐτέραν δίκην, Κάλλαρον ἐπιγραφάμενος τῶν ἐμῶν δούλων· πρὸς γὰρ τοῖς ἄλλοις κακοῖς καὶ

⁶ R. Dareste, *Les plaidoyers civils de Démosthène* (Paris, 1875), I, p. 166; Meier-Schömann-Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 224 f.; P. Guiraud, *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquête romaine* (Paris, 1893), p. 312; Beauchet, *op. cit.*, III, p. 168, IV, p. 402.

⁷ The speaker does not actually say that the award for Callicles' brother also was for 1000 drachmas, but the wording of § 2 does not exclude this assumption. The same is true for the action against Callarus.

τοῦθ' εὔρηται σόφισμα· Καλλάρῳ τὴν αὐτὴν δίκην δικάζονται. This makes it possible to exploit the information contained in § 32 for a theory on the legal nature of the action under discussion. The phrase: τὰ χωρία προσκαταγνώσεται can be understood only to the effect that the action, if successful, brought about the forfeiture to the plaintiff of the estate where the cause of the damage was found,⁸ and this at once answers the question why there was a fixed penalty of 1000 drachmas instead of a valuation of the damage. The law, which provided for the possible forfeiture of the plot, obviously regardless of the actual amount of the damage, also provided for a ransom which the owner might pay to avert the seizure of his property. Greek law certainly was familiar with the idea of the ransom, which throughout classical and Hellenistic Greek is expressed by ἀποτίνειν. Definitely contrasting with ἀποδιδόναι, which connotes the paying of a debt, the verb represents the idea of a payment in order to avoid execution.⁹

Other features of the action, which are disclosed by our speech, fit in with the conclusion arrived at in the preceding paragraph. No claim could be laid unless some man-made¹⁰ obstruction kept the water from following its natural way, which, in addition, had to be a regular, permanent, and publicly acknowledged watercourse.¹¹ The plaintiff charges the defendant with τὴν χαράδραν ἀποικοδομήσαντα βλάπτειν (§ 12), while the defendant takes pains to demonstrate that no such watercourse had been cut short by his wall, since the natural flow of the water ran down the public road which separated the two estates (§§ 12-14); he even accuses the plaintiff of having tampered with that road and caused the inundation by his own fault (§ 22). He dwells at length on the right of every possessor to protect his estate from the influx of undesirable water, except for such water as is carried in a regular creek (§§ 16-19). In a very similar way the Roman *actio aquae pluviae arcendae* required that an artificial

⁸ This sheds light on the heading: πρὸς Καλλικλέα περὶ χωρίου, under which our oration appears in the manuscripts. It hardly deserves Lipsius' scorn, *op. cit.*, p. 681, n. 17. Its author may have been an ancient editor who was still familiar with the legal background of the speech.

⁹ Cf. H. J. Wolff, *T. A. P. A.*, LXXII (1941), p. 427.

¹⁰ This is overlooked by Beauchet, *op. cit.*, III, p. 164.

¹¹ Cf. J. E. Sandys-F. A. Paley, *Select Private Orations of Demosthenes* (3rd ed., Cambridge, 1896), II, p. lxxii.

obstacle (*opus*) be put in the natural way of flowing water, and the rich casuistry with which Roman jurists have elucidated this principle (*Dig.*, 39, 3) ¹² may be cited to illustrate the problems that might arise in Attica as well.

Unlike the Roman action, which was aimed at a removal of the *opus* and restitution of such conditions as had existed before its erection, the *condemnatio* comprising only the value of the restitution and of damages caused by the *opus* after the *litis contestatio*, the Athenian action was based on the fact that damage had already been inflicted. It is apparent, however, that it was not warranted, unless the dangerous construction had been protested against in advance. The defendant insists that his father, who had erected the wall, had never been troubled in more than fifteen years by any protest on the part of either the plaintiff and his family or anybody else (§§ 3-7, 15, 26), and in §§ 4-6 he points out that a formal protestation in the presence of witnesses was the minimum step which should have been taken by the opponents as soon as Tisias built the wall. The importance attributed by him to this argument is manifest in the sentence by which he introduces it in § 3: ἐν μὲν οὖν . . . πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς τούτων λόγους παρέχομαι δίκαιον, and once more in his concluding remark in § 8: ἐγὼ τοίνυν ἱκανὰ μὲν ἡγοῦμαι καὶ ταῦτ' εἶναι πρὸς τὴν τούτων ἀναίδειαν. In support of the inference that a protest was required, Plato's proposal, *Laws*, VIII, 844 C, may be cited, which makes the claim for damages dependent on the defendant's disobedience to an official's order to remove or adjust the obstacle.

The question remains why the defendant, despite his confident words in §§ 3 and 8, deems it necessary to argue at length that his wall was not such an obstacle to the regular flow of water as could possibly justify the plaintiff's action. Unfortunately the speaker does not explain his tactics. But it is possible that Callicles had raised his protest after the defendant had become his father's successor. As a matter of fact, there is one detail which, hardly understandable otherwise, could be explained on the basis of this interpretation. Twice, in § 9 and again in § 35, the speaker insists that he was ready to submit the case to a board of private arbitrators familiar with the locality, but that the plaintiff, contrary to what he now asserts, rejected the offer.

¹² See E. Schönbauer, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung*, LIV (1934), pp. 237 ff.

As the defendant defaulted before the public arbitrator, and no later occasion is conceivable, the offer must have been made in the course of negotiations which preceded the action brought before the public arbitrator, and the occasion may well have been Callicles' protest.¹³ Obviously the defendant had from the beginning denied that the wall obstructed a public watercourse in a fashion which was likely to inflict damage on his neighbor's land.

However this may be, the foundation of the action was the simple fact that the obstruction existed on the defendant's land and had not been removed upon notice, while it was immaterial who had erected it.¹⁴ This becomes clear from, and, at the same time, provides an explanation for, the odd accumulation of actions in the present case. There were two separate suits filed by Callicles and his brother, and in addition (see *supra*, note 2) a third action brought by Callicles against the slave, Callarus. The situation becomes understandable only on the assumption that the claim could be raised by every wronged neighbor against every *actual* possessor of the property where the cause of the damage was found, and this assumption in turn is possible only if we have correctly determined the general character of the action. That much can be said without running into empty guesswork, although the statement involves a number of problems to which the speech offers no solution.¹⁵

¹³ This is a hypothesis, of course. If it be true, the speaker tried to get around the plaintiff's actual protest by passing over the fact in silence, but at the same time making it appear too late in any event, thus putting forward in a crude way an idea which later was clearly formulated by Labeo, *Dig.*, 39, 3, 19 (Pomponius, *lib. XIV ad Q. Muc.*): Labeo ait, si patiente vicino opus faciam ex quo ei aqua pluvia noceat, non teneri me actione aquae pluviae arcendae. To win the votes of those judges who might not be convinced by this argument he pointed out that the actual state of facts did not warrant the action either.

¹⁴ On the one hand, the defendant does not try to capitalize on the fact that it was his father, and not himself, who had erected the wall—except, of course, for the emphasis laid on the absence of any protest raised against Tisias. On the other, the unqualified use of ἀποικοδομήσας, with reference to the defendant himself, in Callicles' plaint (§ 12) excludes the idea that the defendant might be held liable only in his capacity as Tisias' heir.

¹⁵ It would be valuable to know whether Callicles and his brother were joint successors to their father, who for many years had been

In its form as revealed by Demosthenes' oration, the Athenian *dike blabes* for damages caused by water represents a primitive mode of protecting the neighborhood community in rural districts. That such a protection was the legislative idea in shaping the action can now be considered an established fact owing to Partsch's masterly interpretation of the regulations concerning the rights and duties of neighbors as found in the Alexandrian *Dikaionmata*,¹⁶ and an older opinion which sought to explain Callicles' action on the theory of a legal servitude of mere private law need no longer be refuted. To secure observance of the rules of mutual consideration on which the community rested, a member who had suffered from their violation was given the right to seize the plot where the violation occurred, unless he was paid off with the amount, once and for all established by law, of 1000 drachmas. This principle is not surprising in view of the fact that Greek law in its earlier stages was familiar with the idea of putting liability on inanimate objects.¹⁷ The idea is related to, if not identical with, that of the "noxal" liability, by virtue of which persons who suffered injury or damage from slaves or animals might take their revenge directly on them, unless the master of the guilty slave or animal took over the liability by paying off the wronged party.¹⁸ There was of course no question of a "revenge" to be taken on the forfeited piece of land, but the principle is equally distant from that of redressing the actual loss. It was rather a primitive way of providing a material satisfaction for the neighbor to whom the plot had proved detrimental.¹⁹

Tisias' neighbor (§§ 3-4), or owned separate plots, each of which had suffered from the flood. Furthermore, what rules were followed, if several judgments were given with respect to the same plot and the owner was unable to pay the penalties? Various answers can be thought of, but our source provides no basis for a hypothesis.

¹⁶ *Arch. Pap.*, VI (1913), pp. 52 f. Operation of the same idea in the Roman *actio aquae pluviae arcendae* has justly been pointed out by Schönbauer, *op. cit.* This author indeed greatly exaggerates its doctrinal importance, owing to his desire to have the early Roman law conform with national socialist slogans.

¹⁷ Cf. R. Maschke, *Die Willenslehre im griechischen Recht* (Berlin, 1926), pp. 64 f.

¹⁸ As for the Greek form of this institution, see Partsch, *op. cit.*, p. 68.

¹⁹ A special inquiry, on a comparative basis, into this conception is desirable. I mention the distinction between *vindicta* or vengeance in

It was a rigid and archaic rule, and it seems that its inadequacy was felt in the fourth century B. C. Plato, *Laws*, VIII, 844 C-D, suggested a more flexible and modernized system: if neighbors cannot reach an agreement on how to arrange the flow of water, each may call upon an official, and the party who does not comply with the latter's order is liable to the other for double his actual damage; no longer is there any question of a forfeiture of the estate. No source tells us whether the Athenian law was ever reshaped in this or a similar fashion. But the fact that in the Hellenistic epoch a more liberal principle was adopted at least by other Greek cities can perhaps be inferred from lines 99-102 of the Alexandrian *Dikaionomata*. Here it is ruled that he who, within a certain period upon due notice, does not remove trees planted, or a construction set up, too close to his neighbor's plot has to pay the resulting damage, while his opponent may bring about the removal. It is quite possible that analogous regulations²⁰ existed with regard to obstacles to flowing water.²¹

Finally: If the interpretation suggested in this paper is correct, it may also contribute to the solution of the general problem of the so-called *dike blabes* of the Athenian law. The legal nature of the great variety of actions comprised under the denomination βλάβης²² and the exact import of that conception indeed are still unsettled questions. On the basis of our present knowledge, however, this statement seems to be permissible with respect to all of them: The foundation of the action was the mere fact that the plaintiff had sustained material damage, this notion being understood in a broad sense.²³ The cause of the

the strict sense and *noxa*, i. e., the responsibility resulting from a substantial damage, which is proposed for the early Roman law by F. De Visscher, *Studi in onore di Pietro Bonfante* (Milan, 1930), III, pp. 233 ff. (reprinted in the author's *Études de droit romain* [Paris, 1931], pp. 109 ff.). Though open to criticism, as shown by E. Rabel, *Zeitschr. d. Savigny-Stiftung*, LII (1932), pp. 467 ff., De Visscher's study has a bearing upon the problem indicated; cf. also Rabel, *op. cit.*, p. 469.

²⁰ It should be borne in mind, to be sure, that the Alexandrian law visualized conditions in flat country.

²¹ Partsch, *op. cit.*, p. 51, indeed uses Plato's suggestion and the Alexandrian provision to argue against the assumption of a true *dike atimetos* in the Demosthenic case. I hope to have shown that this inference is not inevitable.

²² See, for example, Lipsius, *op. cit.*, pp. 652-64.

²³ Rabel, *op. cit.*, p. 469.

defendant's responsibility, as well as the quality of the harm done to the plaintiff, was different in different cases. This of necessity leads to the conclusion that *dike blabes* was only a common name for a number of strictly defined claims, at least most of which resulted from specific legal provisions,²⁴ while all were characterized by the fact that they were based on a *blabe*, i. e., an unlawful damaging act, behavior, or omission on the part of the defendant,²⁵ so that the plaint could be built on the typical phrase: *ἐβλαψέ με ὁ δεῖνα*. But the nature of the damage, the reason for the defendant's liability, and the character of the sanction were specified in each individual statute. Such a universal and practically unlimited remedy as the *dike blabes* appears to be in its presentation by most modern writers²⁶ not only seems contrary to the legalistic character of the classical Athenian law²⁷ but also seems most unlikely on general principles, as it would have encouraged the worst kind of sycophancy.

HANS JULIUS WOLFF.

²⁴ This is rather confirmed than disproved by *Lex. Seguer.*, p. 350, 6: *ἄθεσμος βλάβη· ἥσαν τινες ἄθεσμοι καλούμεναι βλάβαι, περὶ ὧν νόμος οὐκ ἦν κείμενος*. The *ἄθεσμοι βλάβαι* also must have been strictly defined cases, as otherwise the plural would make no sense. One of these probably was the default on a contract.

²⁵ Just what the term *βλάβη* (fem.) implied should be made the subject of a special investigation. The instances given in the dictionaries (Stephanus, Liddell-Scott, Preisigke) convey the impression that it connotes either the damaging act committed by the wrongdoer or, in a general way, the harm suffered by the victim, while the substantial damage, as understood in terms of an appreciable deterioration of property or of the value of a loss, was expressed by *βλάβος* (neut.); cf. the formula *βλάβη* (plur.) *καὶ δαπανήματα*, which is known from the papyri.

²⁶ This view has found its way even into the most recent literature; see U. E. Paoli, *Studi sul processo attico* (Padua, 1933), p. 86. To the best of my knowledge, the only exception is Maschke, *op. cit.*, p. 114, who justly regards Demosthenes' differentiation (*Or.*, XXI, 43) between *βλάβη ἐκούσιος* and *ἀκούσιος* as a generalized conclusion drawn from a number of individual statutes. (In Demosthenes, XXI, 35, *νόμος* obviously is not meant in the technical sense of *statute*.)

²⁷ See E. Weiss, *Griechisches Privatrecht*, I (Leipzig, 1923), p. 26; V. Arangio-Ruiz, *L'Égypte Contemporaine*, XXIX (1938), p. 24, n. 1.

PINDAR, *NEMEAN*, VII, 31-35.

The reading¹ of the MSS runs thus (without punctuation):

τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται

ὦν θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων
 βοαθῶν τοὶ γὰρ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου
 ἔμολε χθονὸς ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις
 κείται Πριάμου πόλιν Νεοπτόλεμος ἐπεὶ πράθεν κτέ.

For the unmetrical γάρ, παρά is usually read (Schroeder prefers ποτέ); for the unmetrical ἔμολε, μόλον or μόλεν according as one interprets the preceding words. Most commentators have put a comma after βοαθῶν and taken τοί as a relative referring to the βοαθῶι, with the result: "But honour groweth for those whose fame a god causeth to wax fairer, even the departed champions, who came to the mighty centre of Earth's broad bosom" (Sandys). But who are these "champions" or "helpers"? Whom did they help, and why? When did they come to Delphi, and again why? Whether they were assistants of Agamemnon—that is, the Greek heroes at Troy²—or assistants of Ajax or Neoptolemus, this reading asserts that they came to Delphi and are honoured with festivals.³ We cannot but agree with Wilamowitz that all this looks like "utter nonsense";⁴ and Farnell has demolished it. But Farnell's own view cannot stand. His reading (adopted in essentials by Bowra) runs:

τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται

ὦν θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων·
 βοαθοῶν τοι παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου
 μόλεν χθονός, ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις
 κείται, Πριάμου κτέ.

(In Pindar's own writing βοαθοῶν and βοαθῶν would of course be the same.) This leaves the first sentence in excellent shape;

¹ For details see Schroeder's apparatus.

² But Dissen warily observes that Odysseus (cf. vv. 20 f. and other passages of Pindar) must be left out of this.

³ Dissen, despite his vast erudition, confesses that he finds no other evidence for these. Farnell's quotations (*Cults*, IV, pp. 426 f.) suggest (despite the scholiasts) that Pindar has arbitrarily turned an entertainment of god-guests into a reception of heroes.

⁴ *Pindaros*, p. 162.

but the second is ruined by the meaning suggested for *βοαθοῶν*, which Farnell says is explained by *κτέατ' ἄγων ἀκροθινίων* (v. 41) and means "he was really no foe to Apollo, but he came to Delphi as a friend." This will not serve: the word can mean nothing weaker than "coming to the assistance"⁵ of Apollo or the Delphians, as a defender in war, as bringing food in a time of famine, and the like; it cannot be used of a mere friendly visit, even with gifts in hand. The true reading, which seems not to have been suggested in full before,⁶ is probably:

τιμὰ δὲ γίνεται
 ὧν θεὸς ἄβρὸν αὔξει λόγον τεθνακότων
βοαθόον· τῷ παρὰ μέγαν ὀμφαλὸν εὐρυκόλπου
μόλεν χθονός, ἐν Πυθίοισι δὲ δαπέδοις
κείται, Πριάμου κτέ.

"Honour comes to those whose fame God causes to flourish luxuriantly, rescuing them after their death (from ill-repute): therefore it was that Neoptolemus came," etc. Pindar has in mind those who, like Ajax, fall into disrepute during life (vv. 24 ff.) but are rehabilitated after death, a thought foreshadowed in the *τριταῖος ἄνεμος* passage (vv. 17 f.). This serves perfectly to introduce the story of Neoptolemus—as now set forth—for he achieved posthumous honour at Delphi, and his discreditable past is but hinted. *τῷ* on this view looks forward to v. 44—precisely because Heaven restores its favourites to good repute did Neoptolemus seek Delphi, though it meant his death: in reality he was being led to the scene of his glory.

GILBERT NORWOOD.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

⁵ M. Schmidt, who reads *βοαθέων*, was therefore right, as a matter of idiom, in going on to change *τοι γάρ* (or *τοι παρά*) into *τῷ πατρί*, though that sense spoils the logic of the passage, as Farnell shows.

⁶ *τῷ* is identical palaeographically with *τοι*. Every part of my suggestion has been separately offered before. Hermann did great service by taking *βοαθόον* in apposition to *λόγον* and governing *τεθνακότων*. Mezger reads *τῷ . . . μολὼν χθονός ἐν Πυθίοισι γαπέδοις κείται*, but *βοαθόων·*. Fraccaroli (p. 588 n.) reads *βοαθόον· τῷ* but *μόλον*, which latter he takes as first person: "per questo io venni all' umbilico della terra." Wilamowitz (*loc. cit.*), without knowledge of Fraccaroli's view, repeats it: "Deswegen, weil der Nachruhm des Edlen einen *λόγος βοηθός* fordert, bin ich nach Delphi gegangen, wo Neoptolemus liegt."

PAGEANT = LAT. PAGINA.

The *N. E. D.* says of this word: "origin and history obscure"; in a note we find:

The word . . . is known only in English, and in the Anglo-Latin *pagina*.¹ The two main early senses were 'scene displayed on a stage,' and 'stage on which a scene is exhibited or acted.' The relative order of these is not certain; but, so far as instances have been found, the sense 'scene'² appears first. The Anglo-L. *pagina* is in form identical with the known ancient L. *pagina* leaf (of a book), PAGE sb.²; and it is noteworthy that from *pagina* French had, beside the popularly descended *page*, a literary form *pagine*, *pagene* 'page of a book,' which also came into Eng. in the forms PAGINE, *pagyn*(e), *pagen*, and even (in 15th c.) *pagent*, forms which are identical with some of those of *pageant*. There is thus no difficulty so far as concerns form in identifying *pagina* 'pageant' with *pagina*, *pagine*, *pagyn*, *pagent* 'leaf' or 'page.' And it is easy to conceive how the sense 'page' or 'leaf' of a MS. play, might have passed into that of 'scene' or 'act'; but direct evidence connecting the two has not been found. On the other hand, some, who take 'stage' as the earlier sense, have suggested for *pagina* a possible passage of sense from 'tablet or slab (for inscription)' to 'board,' and so to 'stage'; or have seen in the 14-15th c. Anglo-Latin *pagina* a more or less independent formation from the stem *pag-* of L. *pangere* to fix, cognate with L. *compages*, *compago*, *compagina* 'fixing together,' 'joining,' *compaginata* 'fixed together' (whence perh. 'framework') . . .³

[There follows a refutation of the etymology based on Gr.

¹ 1431: "Parabatur machina, satis pulchra, in cuius medio stabat gigas mirae magnitudinis . . . , ex utroque latere ipsius gigantis in eadem pagina erigebantur duo animalia vocata 'antelops'." The meaning "a tableau, representation, allegorical device, or the like, erected on a fixed stage or carried on a moving car, as a public show," in which "scene" and "stage" are combined, may have been the intermediate link between 1) "scene" and 2) "stage"—according to the *N. E. D.*

² "c. 1380 Wyclif," versus "stage" in 1392-93: Cartulary of St. Mary's, Coventry.

³ This is the opinion of Wedgwood who pointed out the *paginare* "compingere" in the poem of Paulinus of Nola: *Solido navem paginatam robore ad pervehendum praeeparat*. From this reference to "fastening by joining" must come the meaning "to compose, to write" as found in Ambrosius: *aliquid de veterum scriptorum* . . .

πηγμα,⁴ and the statement that a supposed *pagina* "boarding" does not exist.]

To the student of Romance the last opinion, which is that of Wedgwood, must be the most convincing. I would accept this with only a slight modification: *pagina*, connected with the family *pangere*, *compages*, illustrates not so much the development "joining" > "framework" > "stage" as "well-joined construction" > "apparatus, machinery, contrivance"—i. e., something which is "prepared" for a certain purpose. One may note the *parabatur machina* which in the text of 1431 is echoed by the phrase *in eadem pagina erigebantur* and the *navem paginatam . . . praeparat* of Paulinus of Nola.

As for the suggestion of "preparation" with the word *pagina*, Ascoli ("Saggi ladini," *Arch. Glott. Ital.*, VII, p. 579) has pointed to the existence of certain words in the Retoromance dialect of the Grisons (Switzerland) which presuppose a Vulgar Latin **paginare* "to join," and which have precisely the meaning "to prepare":

anc. Sopraselva (Obwaldisch): *se páina* "si prepara"
anc. Upper Engadine: *appinó* "preparato"

He lists semantic derivations from this meaning, such as:

<i>pinar</i>	"richten, flicken, ausbessern, zurecht machen"
<i>pinar giantar</i>	"das Mittagessen bereiten"
<i>pinar la schierpa</i>	"die Ackergeräte ausbessern"
<i>pinar lenna</i>	"Holz fällen"
<i>pinar la spisa</i>	"temperar la penna"
<i>pinar las vias</i>	"racconciar la strada"
<i>s'ampinar</i>	"sich gebärden, mit Worten oder Taten"

Bertoni has added (*Arch. Roman.*, I, p. 416) the Misox *s'empiná* "vestirsi," and Ascoli himself, in *Arch. Glott. Ital.*, X, p. 466, has suggested that the Italian *pania* "bird-lime," *impaniare* "to catch a bird with lime" belong to the same *pagina*, *compages*

⁴ Gr. *πηγμα*, preserved in Lat. *pegma crucis* (*Acta S. Cassiani*, see Du Cange) in the meaning "machina lignea in qua statuæ collocabantur" is hardly the origin of the Anglo-Latin *pagina*, but rather a parallel to it: > Gr. *πήγνυμι* "to fasten" related to Lat. *pangere*. *πηγμα* has assumed also the meaning of "honey-comb" in Romance (*R. E. W.*, s. v.), as has *impago*.

family of the meaning "to join," "to arrange effectively,"—i. e. to make preparations for a purpose.

One has been too wont to think of *pagina*, as of many other Latin words, as having only one well-known classical meaning: in this case, that of "page." But this sense itself developed, according to Ernout-Meillet, out of an original *pagina* "trellis" (> "written column, page"); and this "trellis," obviously, must have to do with the basic idea of the word-family *pangere* "to fasten within a whole." Thus, to isolate *pagina* from its background is an artificial procedure which cuts into the very life of the word-family. It must not be forgotten that in some cases popular Latin (along with archaic word usage in old Latin) may be the only way along which we may see the connection of a word with its family—or that Romance, as derived from popular, Vulgar, Latin, can serve precisely to cast a light on these underground semantic developments. Ascoli was correct in explaining the words listed above, not directly out of *pagina* "page" (the word as we know it in Classical Latin), but out of a *pagina* visualized within the *pangere*, *compages* family, and partaking of the semantic possibilities inherent in it. Indeed, one is regularly justified in assuming that any semantic nuance developing in one member of a family may potentially spread to the others. Thus for example we see that Romance forms in Retoromance and Italian go back to an **impago*, *-inis* (R. E. W., s. v.) which, like Lat. *compago* (*cerea*), meant "honey-comb" (not "bolt of a door," as does *impages* in Classical Latin); Romance **impago*, that is, draws its meaning from the original idea of "well-joined construction"⁵ (we see also, incidentally, that the *-es*, *-is* formation alternated with the *-o*, *-inis* formation in the same meaning).

Thus the Anglo-Latin *pagina* "apparatus," "machinery" ("something well-constructed and prepared for a purpose"), which is the root of Eng. *pageant*, has its well-deserved place among the offshoots of the *pangere-compages*, *impago* family, which was still productive in early mediaeval Latin. It is not a "more or less independent formation from the stem *pag-*" (N. E. D.), but a *pagina* dependent on this family. One has

⁵ The family of *pangere* (**pag*, **pog*), along with the variants with *-k* (**pāk*, *pāk*, *pāco*, *pāx*), is supposed to be connected with Germ. *fügen*, *Fug(e)* and Slav. *paz* "joint" (Ernout-Meillet).

been misled by a belief in the solid contours of *pagina*; and the semantic fluency, the to-and-fro flow within the word-family, has gone unperceived.⁶

LEO SPITZER.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

PARLASCIO—PERILASIO.

Under this title Dante Olivieri has discussed, in *Arch. Glott. Ital.*, XXVI (1934), p. 119, the Italian or rather Florentine word (14-16th c.) *parlascio*, *parlagio*¹ "place where the municipal council sat." He suggests that the word is connected with Ital. *parlare* "to speak" (cf. *parlatorium*, Du Cange) only by the secondary influence of popular etymology; the original meaning of the noun was, according to him, that of "amphitheatre," and to support his thesis he offers a careful listing of the available place-names retraceable to this noun—all of which designate towns in which may be found ruins of amphitheatres: from Capua (881 A. D.: *Berolasis*) via Tuscany (936: *Perilasio*, Arezzo; 1031: *Perilasmus*, Florence) to Bergamo (806: *Perelassi*),

⁶ A parallel case, where the Romance scholar is in a position to rectify, by tracing the "flow" within a word-family, the rigidity of our "vocabularious knowledge" of Latin, is offered by the remnants of the *frangere* family in Romance. Not only are there to be found herein echoes of *frangere*, *fracta*, *fractio*, *fractum*, *fractura*, *fragilis*, *fragor*, *fragosus*, *fragium*, *fragulare*, *refringere*, *refragium*, *suffringere*, *suffracta*, *suffrago*, but the *R. E. W.* lists also traces of **fragellare*, **fragicare*, **fragmentare*, and **fragum*—all re-listed in Ernout-Meillet, *Dict. étym. de la langue latine* (which has done so much to make evident the vitality of Latin words as shown by their survival in Romance). And the list of these survivals as given by the two dictionaries mentioned is still by no means complete: G. Rohlfs (*Arch. f. neu. Spr.*, CLXXI, p. 70) has shown that the Ital. *frana* "ravine" is based on a Latin **frago*, *-inis*, hitherto unattested, and his supposition is justified on the one hand by the existence of *suffrago*, *-inis* (which must have meant not only "Knickehle," but also "ravine"—as did **frago*, Ital. *frana*), and on the other by a **fragu*, *-a* (> Southern Ital. *fraga* "ravine," Galician *fraga*, etc.). Here we are witnessing the same free flow, in regard not only to word formation (**frago*, *-inis* ~ **fragu*, *-a*) but also to semantics.

¹ Meyer-Lübke, *R. E. W.*, 6159, s. v. *palatium*, explains *parlagio*, "Parlamentsgebäude in Florenz" as *palatium* + *parlare*, but *palatium* represents an innixture just as secondary as would be *parlare*.

and even to German territories (Windisch, canton of Argau, Switzerland: *Bärlis-grube*; Cologne: *Berlich*).

As for the etymology of the place-names and of the Italian word, he sought an etymon that should begin with *p-* (by syntactical phonetics² this could become *b-*: *li Per-* > *li Ver-* > [by a false reconstruction] *li Ber-*) and he finds this in the Gr. *περίβολος* (in mediaeval Latin *peribolus* "urbis murus, deambulacrum, ambitus templi, septum ecclesiae, xystus, porticus"), the meaning of which would have shifted to that of "amphitheatre," and which would have taken on the Romance suffix *-atium*.³

It is this etymology which I must contest: in the first place there is lacking, in all the attestations he offers, the intervocalic *-b-* (*-v-*); one may compare the normal development, *-bul-* > *-bbi-* in *catenabulum* > *Cadenabbia*. Moreover the *-asis* (*-assi*, *-asius*) form points rather to an etymon with *-asius* than to one with *atium*; the suffix accords less with the *-atium* of *palazzo*—*palagio* (cf. Vittorio Veneto *Palasi*) than with the *-aseu* of *caseum* > *cascio* (*cacio*), *aphasia* > *ambascia*, and it shows predominantly in the mediaeval attestations forms with *-s-* (the form *parlagio* may be under the influence of *palatium* > *palagio*, or may contain the development *-si-* > *-is-* [cf. the Capuan form *Berelais*] > *-gi-*: *palagio* itself is a Fr. *palais* Italianized).

Thus I would suggest a Gr. *περιέλασις* or **περιελάσιον* (from *περιελαύνω* "to drive around," cf. *C. Gl. L.*, II, 402, 35: *περιελαύνω*, *circumago*): *περιέλασις* is attested in the meaning "a driving or riding around," "a place for driving around, a roadway" (Herodotus), cf. *ἔλασις* "a riding," *ἐλασία* "riding, march," *ἐλάσιος* "a driving away [of the epilepsy]." The predominance of *-a-* in *parlascio* speaks against *περιέλευσις* (from *εἰλέθω*)—which might at first glance seem to offer an etymon.

The passage from Herodotus in which *περιέλασις* is attested (I, 179) refers to the walls of Babylon, built by Cyrus:

ἐπάνω δὲ τοῦ τείχεος παρὰ τὰ ἔσχατα, οἰκήματα μουνόκωλα ἔδειμαν τετραμμένα ἐς ἄλληλα· τὸ μέσον δὲ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἔλιπον τεθρίππῳ περιέλασιν.

²It should be called "South Italian" syntactical phonetics. And this accords with the probabilities: the Greek word must have come to the North from the South.

³He must mean *-aceus* in the pejorative meaning (cf. Ital. *-accio*: *vinaccio* "bad wine," etc.), since he says "che accennerebbe . . . allo stato di abbandono in cui quegli edifici si trovavano."

The Blakesley edition comments:

These appear to be a mere covered way along the summit of the wall, on each side of it, something like what is seen in the streets of Bern, and in parts of Chester. One great advantage would be the shade which it furnished to foot-passengers. It does not seem necessary to translate τεθρίπῳ περιέλασιν "room to turn a quadriga," the sense "room for a quadriga to drive round the walls" being as appropriate. Strabo's account is, that there is good room to pass: ὡς τέθριππα ἐναντιοδρομεῖν ἀλλήλους ῥαδίως (xvi. c. i. p. 335).

From the meaning "Mauerumgang," "road on the walls or battlements," the sense "amphitheatre" must have developed. This, however, I am not in a position to attest and must leave it to students in later Greek to do so. The semantic transfer which I am suggesting is surely no more daring than, for example, that which is attested in the Middle Ages, when *amphitheatrum* becomes "cherche de tonnel," "barrel-hoop" (in the mediaeval Abavus glossary; cf. Du Cange, s. v. and Roques, *Recueil général des lexicques français du moyen âge*, I, p. 250). If an "amphitheatre" may become a "hoop," a "round-way" may become an "amphitheatre."⁴

LEO SPITZER.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

NUMISMATIC EVIDENCE OF THE BATTLE OF LYSIMACHIA.

It has not been noticed hitherto that a bronze coin of a much-discussed but common type in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge,¹ is a restrike of historic interest. This coin answers to the following description: \swarrow , 17 mm., 3.26 grms. *Obv.* Macedonian shield, charged with the monogram Mionnet No. 502² (i. e. "Antigonus"). *Rev.* Macedonian helmet; below, Βα σι,

⁴ R. A. Hall, Jr. in his *Bibliography of Italian Linguistics* (1941) lists a treatise which he has not seen personally and which is not mentioned by Olivieri: A. Bellini, *Sulla origine e significato della voce "parlagio": nota filologica* (Girgenti, 1902), pp. 8. I too was unable to find this.

¹ W. M. Leake, *Numismata Hellenica, Kings* (1856), p. 14, No. 8 (Antigonus Gonatas).

² For the monograms mentioned in this note cf. T. E. Mionnet, *Description des médailles antiques. Recueil des planches* (1808).

reversed; on l. and r., monograms Mionnet Nos. 94 and 1272. There are faint remains on the *Obv.* of head of Athena to r., and on the *Rev.* of the inscription *Ανσι μαχεων*, and of a lion to r.

It was hitherto doubtful whether the Macedonian issue of this type was introduced by Antigonus Gonatas or by Antigonus Doson;³ but it can now be considered as certain that it was in use immediately after Macedonia had been reconquered by the son of Demetrius Poliorcetes.⁴ After Antigonus Gonatas had liberated Macedonia from the Celtic menace by the decisive battle of Lysimachia, there must have been a sudden demand for his coins throughout the regained territory. We learn from the new evidence that this demand was partly satisfied by the restriking of coins minted at Lysimachia,⁵ the town near which the victory had been won.

F. M. HEICHELHEIM.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
NOTTINGHAM, ENGLAND.

SOME GREEK AND GRECIZED WORDS IN RENAISSANCE LATIN.

In *Utopia* (1516), Book I, St. Thomas More satirizes certain persons by calling them *Morosophis*.¹ The editor of the standard edition of *Utopia*² tells us that More took the word from Lucian's *Alexander*, 40; it appears there in the form *τῶν μοροσόφων*. Liddell-Scott-Jones cite no user of the word except Lucian, who perhaps invented it. Accordingly it seems established that the word in *Utopia* came from *Alexander*. Yet the next editor of *Utopia* will do well to consider whether it is not more probable that More, instead of taking it directly from

³ Cf. A. R. Bellinger, *Corinth*, III, 1 (1930), pp. 61 f.; D. M. Robinson and P. A. Clement, *Olynthus*, IX (1938), pp. 331 f.

⁴ Cf. W. W. Tarn, *Antigonus Gonatas* (1913), pp. 165 f.

⁵ For the type used for the restriking of the coin in the Fitzwilliam Museum cf. *Brit. Mus. Cat., Thrace*, p. 196, No. 11, and S. W. Grose, *McClellan Collection*, II, No. 4163.

¹ Robynson's translation of 1551 gives "thies wysefooles and very archedoltes."

² J. H. Lupton, ed., *The Utopia of Sir Thomas More* (Oxford, 1895), p. 48, n. 2.

Lucian, borrowed it from his friend Erasmus. It occurs in *Moriae Encomium*,³ which Erasmus wrote in More's home in 1509 and which was published in 1511. Its presence in that work can easily be explained, for Erasmus had translated Lucian's *Alexander* into Latin in 1505 or 1506 (published 1506).⁴ Although More too had translated writings of Lucian, there is no evidence that he knew *Alexander* well or that in 1516 he remembered τῶν μωροσόφων; we do know that Erasmus had remembered it. And it is more likely that More remembered what he read in Erasmus' *Moriae Encomium* than that he recalled a phrase from Lucian's *Alexander*.

The word occurs at least four more times in Erasmus' works. He places it among *novata* in *De Copia* (1512; *Op. Om.*, I, 12 C). In a letter of 1519 he writes: "Philosophia tum per morosophos suos libris ac linguis, per tyrannos gladiis etiam, grassabatur in pusillum ac simplicem Christi gregem, vestigiis et in haec usque tempora relictis."⁵ So in his *De Magnitudine Misericordiarum Domini Concio* (1524): "Cur tu, Morosophe verius quam Philosophhe, obturatis adversus hunc Doctorem [Christum] auribus, Platonibus auscultas, & Aristotelibus?" (*Op. Om.*, V, 580 E). When in *Enarratio Psalmi XXXIII* (1531) he paraphrases *Acts*, xvii, 18, he describes the Stoics and Epicureans as "... μωροσόφοι, hoc est, vere stultam sapientiam hujus mundi profitentes ..." (*ibid.*, V, 382 D). Tunstall, Bishop of London, complains in a letter to Erasmus (1523) of the dangerous prevalence of "... Stoica quadam morosophia ..." (*EE.*, V, 292, 72); he must have learned the word from Erasmus or More. In *EE.*, X, 15, 129 and in the *Antibarbari*,⁶ Erasmus employs a related term, *philosophastri*, which he had found in

³ *Desiderii Erasmi Roterodami Opera Omnia*, ed. J. Clericus (Lugdunum Batavorum, 1703-06), IV, 409 A: μωροσόφους. The latest translator, H. H. Hudson, has "foolosophers" (*The Praise of Folly* [Princeton, 1941], p. 10).

⁴ Cf. C. R. Thompson, *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More* (Ithaca, N. Y., 1940). In his version of *Alexander*, Erasmus translates τῶν μωροσόφων by "qui desipienter sapientes sunt" (*Op. Om.*, I, 239 E).

⁵ *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen, H. M. Allen, and H. W. Garrod (Oxford, 1906—), III, 486, 229-31. This work will be referred to in the text as *EE.*

⁶ Text in A. Hyma, *The Youth of Erasmus* (Ann Arbor, 1930), p. 290.

St. Augustine, *De Civitate Dei*, II, xxvii: "philosophaster Tullius." One of his correspondents has the same word (*EE.*, VI, 396, 123). Compare *theologastris*, in a letter to Erasmus from John Eck, the famous opponent of Luther (*EE.*, III, 209, 25). I fail to find this word in the dictionaries.

Erasmus' ἀριστοτελικώτατος,⁷ applied to St. Thomas Aquinas in *Moriae Encomium* (*Op. Om.*, IV, 469 B), may have been suggested by Lucian's Ἀριστοτελικός. Lucian is the only source given for this adjective by Liddell-Scott-Jones.

Following are a few additional specimens of transliteration of Greek words in Erasmus: *catalalis* (*EE.*, IV, 91, 1 and n.), *philautiam* (*ibid.*, II, 95, 177; cf. IX, 16, 31; IX, 257, 25; *Op. Om.*, IV, 448 B-449 A), *battologiam* (*Op. Om.*, I, 832 E), *dysangelos* (*EE.*, IX, 257, 48), *philobarbarorum* (*ibid.*, IX, 178, 23). That these Latinizations are not in Du Cange, Lewis and Short, or the *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae* does not, of course, mean that Erasmus was the first to use them, although he may possibly have been.

Erasmus' fondness for inventing "Greek" nonce-words may be illustrated by some examples drawn mainly from his letters: *philoscoti* (i. e., Scotists: *EE.*, V, 409, 3), *philalazonia* (*ibid.*, VII, 94, 73), *cacatilem* (*Op. Om.*, I, 824 F), *evangeliphorus* (*ibid.*, I, 831 B), *cacolycos* (*EE.*, IX, 257, 47-8), *tyrologum* (i. e., a friar: *EE.*, VII, 129, introd.), ἐπιφήτης (*ibid.*, VI, 419, 76), διπλωματοφόρος (*Op. Om.*, IX, 1118 B), ἀρχιτύραννος (*EE.*, X, 54, 14), ἀνθελληνίζω (*ibid.*, X, 231, 19), μακρογραφία (*ibid.*, X, 301, 36), πτωχοτύραννοι (i. e., the friars: *ibid.*, IV, 288, 38). Naturally there are numerous ones made from proper names, e. g., φιλέρασμος (*ibid.*, X, 181, 65; X, 311, 85), φιλοβονδαῖοι (i. e., partisans of Budé: *ibid.*, X, 125, 9).⁸

More writes *comicotragicopolemon* (*ibid.*, IV, 230, 515) in a letter to Erasmus. But Erasmus exceeds that with πτωχοτυραννοφιλομονσομαχία (*ibid.*, IV, 208, 13).

C. R. THOMPSON.

ITHACA, NEW YORK.

⁷ Cf. Hudson's rendering, "Aristotelitotical" (*op. cit.*, p. 84).

⁸ Erasmus was once offended when a critic termed him *porrophagum* (*Op. Om.*, IX, 1099 A); "quasi," he retorted, "toties utar hac dictione, aut quasi utar tam inscite" (*EE.*, V, 519, 125-6).

REVIEWS.

Inscriptiones Graecae: Vol. II et III, editio minor. Pars tertia, fasciculus posterior. Edidit JOHANNES KIRCHNER. Pp. vii + 363-922; 2 Plates. Berlin, W. de Gruyter, 1940. M. 196.

The issue of this volume of *I. G.*, II² virtually brings to completion the monumental work begun by J. Kirchner with the publication of the first fascicle in 1913. Only the necessary indices and *fasti* remain. Its indefatigable editor, whose lamented death occurred on June 27, 1940, in his eighty-first year, has in this instalment enriched scholarship with the publication of 8212 inscriptions, 1894 of which, according to our count, had received no previous mention. He has included sepulchral material which ranges from inscriptions copied by early scholars such as Pittakys and Ross and never again edited to the most recent inscriptions found in the excavations of the Agora and the Ceramicus. His work in this fascicle is marked by the same meticulous accuracy and painstaking completeness as that in its predecessors. A volume would be required to treat this admirable work as it deserves with its innumerable new readings and its store of helpful and pregnant suggestions cached in the notes. By way of illustration, it will be impossible for anyone to discuss the topographical problems of Attic demes without reference to the notes in this volume. Kirchner's death is an irreparable loss, but he lived to finish his appointed task and he leaves as a monument this true *magnum opus*.

The initial terminal date of the archonship of Eukleides, which has been accepted for other volumes of *I. G.*, II², is modified in the case of this fascicle. The editor has included sepulchral inscriptions which were negligently omitted from the first volume of the *editio minor*, fifth century inscriptions published since 1924, the year of publication of *I. G.*, I², and many late fifth century inscriptions hitherto unedited. Sepulchral inscriptions for Christians, which were included by W. Dittenberger in the *editio maior*, have been entirely omitted. They will be published in a separate sylloge of Christian inscriptions now being undertaken by J. Leitzmann and G. Soteriou. Also omitted is a considerable number of small fragments such as Dittenberger in his earlier publication judged should be included.

The main divisions of the book are twofold: *tituli sepulcrales* and *tituli memoriales*. First are published eight public funerary monuments (II², 5220-5227). Then in order follow the sepulchral inscriptions of private Athenian citizens arranged according to demoties (II², 5228-7861); twenty inscriptions of *ισοτελαί* (II², 7862-7881); sepulchral inscriptions of foreigners arranged according to ethnics (II², 7882-10530); and, then, sepulchral inscriptions of persons of uncertain origin (II², 10531-13177a). Many of this last group are metrical. A section of *varia* (II², 13178-13187) concludes the private monuments. Next follows a separate class of funerary inscriptions (II², 13188-13228) which contain the pronouncements

of curses against violators. These were erected for the most part by Herodes Atticus (cf. P. Graindor, *Hérode Att.*, pp. 114 ff., and Dittenberger, *Syll.*³, no. 861, note 16). The second main division is a group of inscriptions which were set up in memory of the dead (II², 13229-13247). To the volume there are appended lengthy *addenda et corrigenda* in which Kirchner publishes 135 additional inscriptions, and finally *addenda nova* with 125 new inscriptions. Of this latter group alone, 68 are unpublished inscriptions from the excavations of the Athenian Agora conducted by the American School of Classical Studies. It will be more useful to add some details to this admirable volume (with a few corrections resulting from a comparative study of the squeezes now in the collection of the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton) than to fill a page with mere laudation of the vastness of this great scholar's achievements.

No. 5301. A false reading of a demotic in this inscription has resulted in its publication among the list of Athenian citizens. The actual text is Ἀρτέμων | χρηστός, which must be substituted for Kirchner's reading of Ἀρτέμων | Ἀζηγιεύς.

No. 5500. The text as given by Kirchner reads as follows: Μελησι[α] | Τειμοκλέους | Ἀλαιεύς | γυνή. In line 2 the form of the patronymic must be corrected to Τειμοκλήους. Moreover, the item in Kirchner's first line should not be read as the *nomen* of a woman; it is rather an ethnic. In the line above, the lower part of the first two letters of a name are preserved. These traces can only be interpreted as the initial letters of a patronymic, and the line above this patronymic must have contained the woman's *nomen*. According to Kirchner's classification, the inscription should not be published among the funerary inscriptions for citizens of the deme Halai, but on p. 665 among inscriptions containing fragmentary names of Milesians. The correct text reads: ^{nomen} | \ | - - - | Μελησία | Τειμοκλήους | Ἀλαιεύς | γυνή. On the subject of the frequent intermarriage of Milesians and Athenians, see Hiller in Pauly-Wissowa, *R.-E.*, XV, col. 1616.

No. 5743. Kirchner publishes for this columella the following text: Εὔκλεια | Ατ - - - | Ἀφ[ιδναίου] | γυ[νή]. Our squeeze reproduces the surface of the stone to a distance 0.07 m. below the word Εὔκλεια, and it can be reported that in this space no traces of any letters are visible. Nor do they show on our photograph. This determination is also confirmed by the description of this stone made by the epigraphists of the Agora excavations at the time the stone was discovered. Only seven letters were reported as inscribed. Lines 2-4 must be attributed to a false reading.

No. 5766. In previous publications of this inscription, it has not been noted that the word θυ[γάτηρ] is part of a different inscription made by a different stonecutter from the remainder of the preserved text.

No. 6047. Kirchner corrects Meritt's reading for line 2 from Εὐφιλήτο(ν) to Εὐφιλήτο[ν]. The original surface of the stone, however, is preserved to the right of the omicron, and it is apparent that the upsilon was omitted by the stonecutter.

No. 6308. In line 4, Kirchner has erred in changing θυγάτ[η]ρ of the *editio princeps* (B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, III [1934], no. 90) to γυνή.

No. 6316. For ἐκ Κεραμέων, read [ἐκ Κεραμ]έων; see B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia*, III (1934), no. 91.

No. 6648. In line 1, for [.]av[.], read Φαν[ώ].

No. 7197. It is, we believe, a safe conjecture that this inscription is more correctly published as lines 1-2 of no. 7198. The latter is reported by Kirchner as lost, but the inscription published as 7197, now bearing the Epigraphical Museum No. 6150, preserves the identical name with the letters at the right edge in the same fragmentary state as they are shown in T. Preger's original majuscule publication of 7198 (*Ath. Mitt.*, XIX [1894], p. 140). Moreover, Kirchner's date for no. 7197 agrees with Preger's determination that the script was of the fourth century.

No. 7281. The demotic in line 3 should be read as [Πρ]ασιεύς. [Λου]σιεύς is not a possibility.

No. 7775. The form of the patronymic in line 2 was inscribed as Λευκίδου, not Λεύκιδος. For the name, see F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen*, p. 278.

No. 7779. For Ἐπιγ[έ]νου, reproduced by Kirchner from Meritt's original publication, read Ἐπιγόνου. The omicron is preserved.

No. 8861. The third letter of the *nomen* should be read as a rho, not a gamma, and the preceding letter is an omicron. Δορκ[άς] is a possible restoration.

No. 9411. The *nomen* in line 1, composed of widely spaced letters, may be restored as Σο[φί]α. The inscription occupies three lines (marks to indicate the beginning of a new line have fallen out of Kirchner's text in nos. 5928, 12551, 12736, 13038, and 5718a).

No. 10122. The text of this inscription is almost completely preserved. It reads: Εὔνου | Σίμωνος | [Π]τολεμαεύς (with iota omitted). This should be substituted for Kirchner's text, which now reads: [Εὔ]νου? | . . . ωνος | [Πτ]ολεμαεύς.

No. 10258. The letters -- ορον are preserved of the patronymic. The first omicron is above the first nu of the line below.

No. 11969. The name in line 2 should be read as Σαδόκου (cf. Thucydides, II, 29, 5). In the third line, an epsilon can be read in the fourth letter-space. This person may have been a native of the town Πρόερνα; see Strabo, IX, 434.

No. 12313. For the reading Νικῶ | Νικρ--- should be substituted Νίκων | Νικίου. In addition, two certain letters of the ethnic in line 3 are preserved, so spaced that the restoration [Ἡπ]ε[μ]ώ[της] is possible. Additional letters, however, may be recovered from a better squeeze.

No. 12551. Retention of Koehler's restoration of [Πυθί]λ[λ]ον for the patronymic is impossible, for the apex of the uncertain lambda is between the third and fourth letters of the line above and in the first letter-space is preserved the top sloping stroke of a sigma. The line reads Σ..Λ.ον, for which there are several possible restorations.

No. 12786. Large type for the name in line 2 is not justified, since the letters are identical in size with the following ones. The letters of lines 2-4 were inscribed in stoichedon order.

No. 12961. For Φιλόμηλος | . . . ωνος, read Φιλόμηλος | [Ξ]ένωνος.

No. 13038. Attention should be called to the fact that the name Χαιρεστράτη was incised in a *rasura*. The second line, instead of

being an added item as Kirchner writes, may have been part of the original inscription.

No. 13167. This inscription has hitherto been known only from a transcription furnished to W. Dittenberger by Otto Lüders, the first secretary of the German Institute in Athens. This transcription was first published as *I. G.*, III, 1375 and has now been republished in identical form as *I. G.*, II², 13167. Kirchner's text reads as follows: πολλοὶ ΙΟΤΟΤΩ | περιοδεῦσαι | ἐνθάδε κῆμε | μάτην πονέσαι | χ<ρ>όνους. Contrary to so many cases of the transmission of faulty texts, we are fortunate in possessing a control over Lüders' copy; for the stone, undiscovered by Kirchner, is now in the Epigraphical Museum with the number 9866. The writing is in a modified cursive script of the third or fourth century of our era. Sigma is in the form of a cursive epsilon with the middle stroke omitted. In three cases Lüders has misinterpreted this form as an iota. A beta in the eighth letter-space of his first line was misread as an omicron. Since the loop of the following letter, which is really a rho, is partly chipped away, Lüders read the preserved strokes as a tau. The horizontal stroke over the final omega of the line is a mark of abbreviation indicating that the word should be expanded as a genitive plural, βροτῶ(ν), a form which is frequently attested after a preceding form of πολλοί. Above the pi of πολλούς, there appears the lower part of a vertical stroke. The following text is offered: | --- | πολλούς βροτῶ(ν) | περιοδεύσας | ἐνθάδε κῆμε | μάτην πονέσας | χρόνους.

Only in the *addenda nova* does this reviewer encounter a section which is not entirely satisfactory. Here Kirchner was dependent on the transcriptions of others, although he apparently possessed squeezes of most of the texts, the majority of which are inscriptions from the Athenian Agora. Several errors in reporting the Agora inventory numbers have already been corrected in a communication to the editors of *Hesperia* and these have been included in a publication in that journal (X [1941], pp. 398-401). Some textual corrections are noted below.

No. 7834a. The text of this inscription, which has been reported by Kirchner as [Ἀρι]σταγόρα | [Ἀρισ]τοτέλους | .ε.ε.ε.έως | [θυγ]άτηρ, should be corrected to read: [Ἀρι]σταγόρα | [Ἀρι]στοτέλου | [Πει]ραίεως | [θ]υγάτηρ.

No. 7840a. The text in the *editio minor* reads: Θεόξενος | ...πείθου | .ε.ε.ε.ίδης. For this should be substituted: Θεόξενος | Νικ[ο]πείθου | Βερ[ε]νικίδης.

No. 8104. This inscription was known only from Fourmont's copy, as published by A. Böckh (*C. I. G.*, no. 822), until its rediscovery in the Athenian Agora (see Kirchner in the *addenda nova sub* no. 8104). Kirchner does not change Fourmont's reading of Αἰσχρώ for the *nomen*, although the stone now reveals that this must be corrected to Αἰσχρον. This feminine name is attested from II², 1534, line 194; cf. F. Bechtel, *Die attischen Frauennamen*, p. 49. The letter-forms appear to be of the second century before Christ.

No. 8548a. The patronymic which Kirchner reads as Παρ..ου should be corrected to Πυρρίου.

No. 10249. The brackets should be removed from the ethnic in line 3, for the letters are plainly preserved in this inscription, rediscovered in the Agora.

No. 12114a. In place of $M\eta[\nu]\acute{o}\delta o[\tau o s] \mid \Phi o - - -$, read $M\eta[\tau]\rho o\delta\omega[\rho - -] \mid \Phi\rho - -$. The rhos are certain.

No. 12547a. A new reading for the ethnic in line 3 may be offered where Kirchner reads only an eta, which is below and slightly to the right of the second omicron of $[T\epsilon]\mu o\delta\acute{o}\tau[ov]$. Following this eta is a tau and preceding it is an upright stroke of what may well be a nu. The ethnic may be restored as $[A\acute{\iota}\gamma\iota]\nu\eta\tau[is]$.

No. 13056a. It should be noted that the text published by Kirchner was inscribed over a four line inscription which had been carelessly erased. The fourth line comprised the word $\theta u\gamma\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta\rho$, and in the first line part of the woman's name is visible as $E\upsilon.\tau.\iota s$, for which the restoration $E\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\chi\iota s$ may be suggested; cf. *S. E. G.*, IV, no. 12.

Kirchner has given the place of discovery and the present location of all inscriptions whenever this information was known to him. In many cases, however, he has been forced to report that an inscription could not be found, and sometimes he has given its present location incorrectly. This information is of importance; so we note in the following list such inscriptions which are now to be found under their proper number in the Epigraphical Museum. No. 5735 is now E. M. 8830; no. 5923, E. M. 10489; no. 6234, E. M. 9092; no. 6254, E. M. 2926; no. 6406, E. M. 278; no. 6595, E. M. 10013; no. 6814, E. M. 2872; no. 6826/7, E. M. 9127; no. 6848, E. M. 9717; no. 6877, E. M. 1945; no. 6986, E. M. 9722; no. 7024, E. M. 9723; no. 7160, E. M. 2096; no. 7214, E. M. 9151; no. 8362, E. M. 10977; no. 9134, E. M. 5102; no. 10243, E. M. 8146a; no. 10495, E. M. 9306; no. 10555, E. M. 3345; no. 10727, E. M. 25; no. 10936, E. M. 9773; no. 10978, E. M. 10286; no. 11318, E. M. 9362; no. 11595, E. M. 427; no. 11670, E. M. 3625; no. 12062, E. M. 9405; no. 12622, E. M. 9441; no. 12650, E. M. 3078; and no. 13195, E. M. 12466. Both no. 8385 and no. 11268 have now been transferred to the Epigraphical Museum (*sine nr.*)

There are also several instances in which the Epigraphical Museum number as reported by Kirchner has been found to differ from the number written on the squeeze in the Institute for Advanced Study. The Princeton numbers were transcribed by a technician in Athens at the time the impressions were made. Although no control can be exercised over these figures, it can be demonstrated in a few cases that these, and not Kirchner's, are the correct numbers, so the entire list is presented here by way of comparison. Our no. 5615 is marked, not as E. M. 5254 (Kirchner), but as E. M. 5224; no. 5662, not E. M. 10960, but E. M. 11060; no. 5909, not E. M. 1706, but E. M. 9706; no. 6098, not simply as E. M., but as E. M. 495; no. 6819, not E. M. 4716, but E. M. 9716; no. 7017, not E. M. 9141 (this is correctly published as no. 7246), but E. M. 9149; no. 7071, not E. M. 10956, but E. M. 11056; no. 7381, not E. M. 10453, but E. M. 10455; no. 7410, not E. M. 10802 (this is correctly published as no. 6364), but E. M. 1802; no. 7633, not E. M. 10955, but E. M. 11055; no. 8444, not E. M. 9207a, but E. M. 2907a; no. 8552, not E. M. 10841, but E. M. 9741; no. 10743, not E. M. 8854, but E. M. 8851; no. 11057, not E. M. 3947, but E. M. 9347; no. 11292, not E. M. 8507, but E. M. 5807; no. 11561/2, not E. M. 6188, but E. M. 6182; no. 11602, not

E. M. 3234 (this appears to be *I. G.*, III, 962), but E. M. 3231; no. 11763, not E. M. 3889, but E. M. 9389; no. 12816, not E. M. 9459, but E. M. 9457; no. 12888, not E. M. 8805, but E. M. 8865; no. 12903, not E. M. 16568, but E. M. 10568; no. 12943, not E. M. 11105, but E. M. 9464; no. 12948, not E. M. 9699, but E. M. 9692; no. 13029, not E. M. 11110, but E. M. 11510; no. 13064, not E. M. 11077, but E. M. 11087; no. 13099, not E. M. 9471, but E. M. 8897; and no. 13106/7, not E. M. 11112, but E. M. 11512. No. 7947 is incorrectly reported as E. M. 19997. No. 12883, which Kirchner states he was unable to locate, is correctly reported as E. M. 8883 and a squeeze is now in Princeton.

Of interest to Americans will be the Attic funerary inscriptions which have been transported to the United States. These are now to be found in Baltimore (II², 9391a, 10575a, 11646, 11865a, and 12721a); Boston (II², 11790); Cleveland (II², 12872); Kansas City (II², 5495a, 5511a); Minneapolis (II², 12961a); New York (II², 7090, 7287, 11771a, and 12013 at the Metropolitan Museum; II², 6984a, 10711a, and 11840a in the private collection of V. G. Simkhovitch); Philadelphia (II², 11012, 11118, 11874, 11911, 12091); and St. Louis (II², 7061a). Eight of these had not previously been published, and Kirchner acknowledges his indebtedness to Sterling Dow of Harvard University for supplying information concerning them.

W. KENDRICK PRITCHETT.

ARTHUR BERNARD COOK. *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion.*

Volume III: *Zeus God of the Dark Sky* (Earthquake, Clouds, Wind, Dew, Rain, Meteorites). Part i: Text and Notes (pp. xxix + 974). Part ii: Appendixes and Index (pp. 975-1299). Cambridge, University Press, 1940.

A quarter of a century after the appearance of the first volume (1914) Professor Cook's massive work is now complete, with a grand total of 3696 pages. It consists of two main parts: the first, which is entitled *Zeus God of the Bright Sky*, is comprised within the first volume; the second, *Zeus God of the Dark Sky*, occupies the two remaining volumes. Volume II (1925) deals with the manifestations of Zeus in thunder and lightning; Volume III contains the discussion of the other phenomena of the Dark Sky which are named in the subtitle, a section called "General Conclusions with regard to Zeus as God of the Dark Sky," and some 131 pages of Addenda to all three volumes. The Index in Volume III (99 pages) is not a comprehensive index to the whole work, but, like the index in each of the other volumes, covers only the single volume. Like the other two indexes it is divided into two parts, the first containing references to "Persons Places Festivals"; the second, references to "Subjects Authorities." Like the two earlier volumes the final volume is richly illustrated, containing eighty-three plates and 930 figures in the text. It is impossible to praise the manage-

ment of the Cambridge University Press too warmly for their high-minded devotion to scholarship in the publication of this whole vast work and for the care and skill which are evident in every detail of the production of the books themselves. They have erected a noble monument of English learning and English book-making.

The multitude of scholars to whom "Cook's *Zeus*" is already familiar will find that the new volume is simply a continuation of the work which has long been in their hands. They will be able to use it exactly as they have used the previous volumes. Indeed, the three volumes are so exactly alike in form and spirit that it would seem as if they had been born at a single birth and not at wide intervals in the space of a quarter of a century. "Year in, year out," says Professor Cook, "I have steadily pursued the plan originally laid down for the scope and contents of the book." It is amazing that an enterprise of such magnitude has been carried through with such inflexible purpose and that the initial aspiration has been fulfilled with such completeness and perfection. For this achievement the author deserves the admiration and homage of the learned world.

In particular, he has not allowed himself to be turned aside by the criticism of earlier reviewers from the intention of permitting himself the right of unlimited digression. The objection that "one cannot see the forest for the trees," and similar facetious remarks, have not disturbed him. "I have deliberately chosen the more devious method," he says, "and I can only fall back on Herodotos' plea that 'my subject from the outset demanded digression.'" For this one can only be grateful, because, whatever derogation it may be to the dignity of the august personage who plays the title-rôle in the piece, the chief value of the book lies in its innumerable digressions, large and small. In the present volume the meteorological phenomena with which Zeus is connected provide an opportunity for the introduction of long studies on related matters of great interest and importance. The longer and more significant of these are devoted to the complex of myths and cults connected with the Arrephoroi, the daughters of Kekrops, the birth of Erichthonios, and the relations of Hephaestos and Athena; to the use of the sieve, or holed vessel, in rain-magic, in marriage, and in the mysteries, together with the myth of the Danaides; to the birth of Athena, the east pediment of the Parthenon, and the lore connected with the olive, snake, owl, and aegis of Athena. Each of these sections occupies approximately one hundred pages, together with the illustrative plates. Other topics of great interest which are discussed at great length are Aristophanes' *Nephelokokkygia*, the clouds in cult and myth, the Tritopatores, rain-magic in ancient and modern Greece, the myth of Danae, the ritual of the *Dipolieia*, floating islands, and the *Hieros Gamos*.

One may suspect that Cook's book will be used more often as a work of reference than for continuous reading,—and this in spite of the fact that it is written in an engaging style, devoid of pedantry and illuminated not infrequently with humorous observation. The reader is beset by formidable obstacles which he must go around. The continuity of the text is interrupted by footnotes so extensive that often there are only two or three lines of text to a page, or even none. The

footnotes, indeed, occupy much more space than the text itself. The wide-ranging erudition in the text demands slower and more thoughtful reading than the beguiling style has patience for; the extended digressions disturb the unity of treatment. In these respects it must be acknowledged that there is justice in the criticism that one cannot see the forest for the trees. Zeus is elusive. For these and other reasons it is not a book of first resort for one who wishes to learn, with some philosophical breadth, what Zeus was to the Greeks. But as a work of reference concerning Zeus and a thousand other things it is indeed a work of first resort. One will turn to it as he does to Pauly-Wissowa, Roscher, Daremberg and Saglio, Frazer, and Hastings. Its wealth of learning, its full documentation, literary and archaeological, its countless plates and figures, its full bibliographies, its résumés of research and controversy, make it indispensable. It will not always be easy, however, to find what one wants. The indexes are full and generous, but no index could do justice to all the items that should be recorded. And in the indexes no device has been adopted to enable one to find the principal discussion of a topic. One is reminded of the difficulty and embarrassment encountered in the use of Otto Gruppe's great *Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte*.

The manifestations of religion in the Greek world were so pervasive and touched so many aspects of its life and culture that students are affected by a variety of motives and purposes in their investigation of them. Cook's book brings into sharp focus one particular method of approach. He is, by predilection, an aetiologist. The purpose of the aetiologist is to explain how things came to be as they are,—what was the origin of the incidents of a myth, of the details of a rite, of the figures and symbols in artistic representations, of the names and epithets of gods. Men have always been inquisitive about such things. The very aetiological myths which are the object of our own study are the product of instinctive groping in this direction. The *Aitia* of Callimachus, Plutarch, and many other writers are evidence of the persistent interest of the ancients. At the present time inquiries of this sort have been vastly stimulated and facilitated by the prolific discoveries of archaeologists and anthropologists. We have come to see that the origin of the religious phenomena of Greece is often clearly to be discerned in the prehistoric culture of the ancient world or to be conjectured in the primitive cultures of the present day. Research along these lines has already led to many brilliant discoveries, and we may be sure that it will be more and more fruitful in the future. But in a book like Cook's one may ask whether a too constant preoccupation with aetiology may not be detrimental to its larger purpose. It seems to show its effect both in what he has done and in what he has left undone.

The use of archaeological material as evidence for restoration of the details of ancient culture is beset with great difficulty and demands wide learning, patience, and ingenuity. The work of Cook exhibits these qualities in an eminent degree, and the results of his researches are always impressive and stimulating. But it cannot be denied that they are sometimes impaired by defects which are not uncommon in the work of investigators in this field.

Investigation of this kind, by its very nature, must operate by means of conjecture, in the interpretation of the objects of evidence, in their restoration, in the determination of their mutual influence upon one another, and in many other aspects of their study. But the enthusiasm of the investigators and their craving to know and to understand lead them too often to promulgate hazardous guesses which, though extremely plausible and not impossible, are still utterly uncertain. The method of inquiry by hypothesis is sound and fruitful, and it is to be expected that many hypotheses will be proposed which will not stand the test of scrutiny. Even if it is rejected, a hypothesis may open up further paths to explore. But too many unsound hypotheses only add to the confusion. The sowing of tares is a bad business. A clever guess is not enough; it must save *all* the appearances. Searching dialectic is needed to substantiate it. The brilliant guessers would do more for scholarship and make things easier for others if they would apply the dialectical process themselves, more critically, before they propose their guesses to the world. Now it is to be regretted that Cook has not always done this. He supports his conjectures with great learning and winning plausibility, but one fears that too many of them will not be approved in the judgment of scholars. This is the more to be regretted—and here is the principal point—in a book which the world would like to accept as a rounded and authoritative work on a great subject. It is unfortunate that hazardous guesses should form so large a part of its structure.

Another failing of archaeological investigators is that they not infrequently give undue time and attention to matters which after all, in the large view, are trivial and unimportant. They are led to this by the very richness of their material and by their conscientious determination to be exhaustive and thorough. Nothing, indeed, is worth seeking but the truth, but not all truth is worth the seeking. It should not always be a matter of pride to have devoted long and laborious research to the substance of a footnote. The determination of values in these matters is difficult and delicate, but at least the element of value should not be disregarded. One of the values, to be sure, is the satisfaction felt by the investigator himself when he has duly completed a piece of research, however uninteresting or insignificant the results may be to others; and there is always the chance that they may prove to be more important than is at first suspected. Cook has claimed the right to inquire into any problem that presents itself in the course of his main task, and in doing so he has carried through by way of digression many pieces of inquiry of major importance. But besides these there are disquisitions, both touching Zeus and touching other subjects, the chief worth of which, it would seem, lies in the gratification which the author feels in his own thoroughness. Again it is to be regretted that the proportions of his larger design in a book on Zeus are somewhat distorted by the obtrusion of too many minor matters,—minor, at least, in their present setting.

Some justification and illustration of these criticisms may be found in an examination of the first chapter of the new volume, entitled "Zeus and the Earthquakes." This chapter consists of twenty-nine pages and three plates. Of the twenty-nine pages,

which include six figures, about six pages are covered by the main text and about twenty-three by footnotes. In these twenty-nine pages are discussed such things as the incidence of earthquakes in Greece, notable earthquakes of ancient times, the attitude of primitive peoples and of modern Greeks to earthquakes, the words *ρηξίχθων*, *ἐνοσίχθων*, *ἐννοσίγαιος*, *γαίηοχος*, and the cosmological views of Babylonians, Pythagoreans, Thales, Artemidorus, and the Christian fathers. The direct evidence which is cited for the connection of Zeus with earthquakes is: 1) *Iliad*, I, 528 ff., where Olympus is shaken by the nod of Zeus; 2) the closing lines of the *Prometheus* of Aeschylus, where an earthquake is included in the cosmic convulsion with which Prometheus is overwhelmed by Zeus; 3) the earthquake which is caused by Pisthetaerus, the "new Zeus," at the end of the *Birds* of Aristophanes; 4) the inclusion of the epithet *σεωίχθων* among the many which are applied to Zeus in the *Orphic Hymn to Zeus* (15, 8); 5) reports of two earthquakes, one in Antiocheia on the Orontes and the other in Smyrna, in the second century A. D., for which Zeus seems to have been held responsible. But the principal reason for asserting the connection of Zeus with earthquakes is that "Poseidon was but a specialised form of Zeus, his trident being originally the lightning-fork of a storm-god."

Now the theory that Poseidon is but a specialized form of Zeus is developed at great length in Volume II (pp. 582 ff., 786 ff.). It rests upon etymological and archaeological arguments. After a long discussion of the name Poseidon, Cook concludes that the first element in the compound is connected with *posis*, "lord," and that the whole name, *Potei-Dan*, or the like, means "Lord Zeus," just as the Homeric *potnia Here* means "lady Hera." On the archaeological side Cook describes at great length, and with abundant illustration, the history of the shape of the thunder-weapon in the art of the Near East and Greece. Since the weapon sometimes appears as a three-pronged spear he raises the question whether the familiar attribute of Poseidon was originally identical with the thunderbolt of Zeus. On the basis of evidence which he adduces he answers the question in the affirmative. In particular he discusses the marks in the rock beneath the north porch of the Erechtheum. If it was originally believed that these marks were caused by Erechtheus, the "Cleaver," a lightning-god like Zeus *Kataibates*, and if Poseidon, with whom Erechtheus was identified in the fifth century B. C. (if not earlier), wielded the lightning,—that is, if his trident was originally the thunderbolt,—"the transition from the cult of Erechtheus to the cult of Poseidon is much facilitated." Direct evidence that Poseidon was thought of as a lightning-god is almost non-existent. "Once, and once only, in the extant remains of Greek art is he represented brandishing a bolt as though he were Zeus." The object referred to is a tetradrachm of Messana, which is assigned to the fifth century B. C.

Over against the arguments for the identity of Poseidon and Zeus, Cook frankly acknowledges that classical antiquity as a whole viewed the trident as a fish-spear. "But," he says, "the point is not, what the Greeks and Romans of the classical age took the trident to be, but what it originally was." This, of course, may be the "point" if Cook chooses to regard it so. But it is not the only

point, and perhaps not the most important point. Cook, like other aetiologists, has a taste for abandoning the bright beauty of the known world of history to pick his way uncertainly in the shadowy prehistoric world of dimly seen and intangible shapes. What happened in the "olden times" has an irresistible fascination for all, children and scholars alike. But too much insistence on the origin of a thing distorts the proper understanding of the thing as it is when the origin is forgotten. One does not know any more about the meaning of "wicked" in modern English by being told that it originally meant "bewitched," and if he tries to understand it in the light of this derivation he is only led astray. The greater bulk of the idea of a god is not the seed from which it sprang, but the increment which came afterwards.

But, even if we assume that the origin of the trident is properly the "point" in the present inquiry, are we really convinced that Zeus and Poseidon were at the beginning somehow one? How did the differentiation come about? In the first place, why should a purely honorific title like *Potei-Dan*, "Lord Zeus," a title which implies no particular attribute or function, come to be recognized as the name of a new divine personality distinct from Zeus? Did this new god become the god of the sea after he had received his name? If so, why? Or was it the god of the sea, already recognized, to whom the name "Lord Zeus" was later applied? If so, there was no new god, but only Zeus,—if, as Cook says (I, p. xii), "the unity of an ancient god consisted less in his nature than in his name." In the second place, if the Greeks knew that Poseidon was "Lord Zeus," god of the thunderbolt, why did they interpret the lightning-fork of the thunder-god, in designs borrowed from the east, as a fish-spear? Was it the chance resemblance of the lightning-fork to a fish-spear that generated the idea that the god with the lightning-fork was the god of the sea? Doubtless, some plausible concatenation of the undated events could be devised. But plausibility is not enough. Plausibility may be only a mask which makes the false look like the true. If plausibility were enough, we might say that Zeus and Poseidon were always two distinct gods, as distinct as their names, that the name Poseidon has no etymological connection with the name Zeus (Kretschmer might be right in his suggestion that Poseidon comes from *Potei Das*, "Lord—Husband—of the Earth-goddess"), that the fish-spear had always been the attribute of Poseidon (the three-pronged fish-spear, *τρίαινα*, was after all in actual use by fishermen), and that the representation of the three-pronged lightning-fork in art had some influence on the representation of the three-pronged fish-spear which is held by Poseidon in Greek works of art. Whether something like this is true or not, we cannot accept with any confidence the theory that "Poseidon was but a specialised form of Zeus."

This being so, there is little justification in treating Zeus as a god of earthquakes. One cannot take seriously the passages in Homer, Aeschylus, and Aristophanes as evidence of it. A little shaking of the earth might naturally be expected to accompany the manifestation of Zeus' royal power on such impressive occasions. If these documents have little weight, the later ones that are cited have still

less. One wonders, therefore, that Cook should have chosen to give the prominence of a special section to "Zeus and the Earthquakes" when the whole discussion, interesting and useful as it is in numberless details, rests upon so insecure a foundation. And this prominence is the more surprising in view of the fact that none of the more mature and spiritual aspects of Zeus is honored by a special caption and a special section in the framework of the book.

After this example of the exuberance which characterizes Cook's work, it may seem captious to complain that anything has been left undone in a book so comprehensive. But there is some justification for doing so. Putting it briefly, one may say that the subject of the book is not primarily Zeus, but things about Zeus, τὰ περὶ τὸν Δία. It may be that the etymon of Zeus is latent in the book, and that the attentive reader will have grasped it when he has reached the end. But the author has not made it easy for him to do this. The etymon of a god is not the sum of all the things that the historian can discover about his epithets, attributes, and functions, the myths that were told of him, and the rites that were performed in his honor. It is the idea of him which is lodged in men's minds. To know Zeus is to know this idea of him. To be sure, it is not an idea perfect and unchangeable, laid up in the heavens. It is an idea which is never quite the same at two different places, at two different times, in the minds of two different men. It embodies just so much of the traditional connotation of the name as a particular person at a particular time and place is aware of, together with the enrichment or impoverishment caused by his own intellectual, moral, and aesthetic disposition. No Greek who ever lived knew, or could know, the infinitely Protean god whom Cook presents. Perhaps it is too much to ask, when he has given us so much (for which we should be, and are, deeply grateful), that he should also have expounded the complex history of the idea and its more important manifestations. But it is just the lack of this element of philosophical exposition and interpretation which leads one to say that Cook's book is not one which would meet the needs of an inquirer who wished to know what Zeus meant to the Greeks,—unless he is willing to construct for himself the idea of Zeus, at the cost of much labor, out of the materials with which Cook supplies him in abundance. Perhaps the things which we miss could have been provided, without any reduction in the value of the book as it is, if Cook had been willing to write a straightforward and continuous exposition of his views on Zeus, with the essential documentation, and to relegate to excursuses the hundreds of topics, large and small, which are embedded in the text and the footnotes. Or perhaps he planned to give us what we miss when he expressed the hope, in the preface to Volume II, "to conclude at long last with a general survey of the Sky-god and his cult as constituting one factor in the great fabric of Greek civilisation," and then was unable for some reason to fulfil his promise. But a reviewer can do nothing more odious than to linger over what an author has not done, especially when what he *has* done is so stupendous and breath-taking. Professor Cook has flown high and far on strong wings, and it is unbecoming for jackdaws on the ground to scold at him.

ἔστι δ' αἰετὸς ὠκὺς ἐν ποτανοῖς,
ὃς ἔλαβεν αἶψα, τηλόθε μεταμαϊόμενος,
δαφνοῖν ἄγραν ποσὶν·
κραγέται δὲ κολοιοὶ ταπεινὰ νέμονται.

IVAN M. LINFORTH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

CHARLES H. BUCK, JR. A Chronology of the Plays of Plautus.
Baltimore, 1940. Pp. 112. (Diss.)

During the past twenty-five years many new studies have appeared on the chronology of Plautus' plays and the development of his art.¹ Numerous criteria have been used to determine the relative order of the plays, e. g. historical allusions (Maurenbrecher, Püttner, Westaway, Enk), the amount of originality (Westaway), metrical form (Püttner) and especially the relative frequency of lyric (Sedgwick), the use of Greek words (Hough), the development of Plautus' art (Sedgwick, Hough), the handling of the intrigue (Hough), link-monologues (Hough), periodic sentence-structure (Schneider). As a result of these studies, many different chronologies of the plays have been established; although the conclusions have shown a surprising agreement in many respects,² there is still great uncertainty concerning the date of many comedies.

One turns therefore to Dr. Buck's newly published dissertation with the hope that it will contain a thorough examination and evaluation of the work which has recently been done, and that it will give more definitive results than have as yet been attained. Dr. Buck's work, begun under the guidance of the late Professor Tenney Frank, contains much of interest and value, but leaves one with a feeling of regret that the author has not given to the subject as thorough a treatment as could be desired. Buck believes that the measuring-stick for the chronology is the events of the age (p. 1), and in his analyses of the individual plays he seeks to determine their dates by allusions to contemporary events, drawing occasional support from the metrical arguments of Sedgwick. Buck refers to the chronologies of Westaway, Sedgwick, and Hough, and states

¹ Cf. K. M. Westaway, *The Original Element in Plautus* (Cambridge, 1917), pp. 76-82; W. B. Sedgwick, *C. R.*, XXXIX (1925), pp. 55-58; *C. Q.*, XXIV (1930) pp. 102-5; J. N. Hough, *A. J. P.*, LV (1934), pp. 346-64, LX (1939), pp. 422-35, *Class. Phil.*, XXX (1935), pp. 43-57, *T. A. P. A.*, LXX (1939), pp. 231-41; J. Schneider, *De enuntiatis secundariis interpositis quaestiones Plautinae* (Dresden, 1937), pp. 169-82; P. J. Enk, *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde*, II, 1 (Zutphen, 1937), 2 vols., *passim*. The results of earlier investigations are summarized in B. Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus und Verschleifung im alten Latein* (Leipzig, 1899), pp. 141-46, and especially in V. Püttner, *Zur Chronologie der Plautinischen Komödien* (Ried, 1906).

² The one exception is Schneider's chronology based on the development of the periodic sentence in Plautus. His results seem far from successful; cf. Hough in *A. J. P.*, LX (1939), pp. 500 f.; Duckworth in *C. W.*, XXXII (1939), pp. 17 f.

(p. 21) that these studies "have shown agreement in their conclusions which is far too close to be considered coincidence; the resultant groupings of the plays . . . cannot be disregarded in any subsequent attempt to date single plays by means of allusions to contemporary events." One looks in vain, however, for any consideration of the chronologies of Westaway, Hough, etc., in the Conclusion (pp. 105-7), where Buck gives his own chronological listing of the plays.

The Introduction (pp. 1-24) is perhaps the most suggestive and interesting part of the dissertation. Here the author summarizes the theories concerning Plautus' life and dramatic activity, and attempts to reconstruct his biography. He interprets *in operis artificum scaenicorum* to mean that Plautus was an actor in Atellan farce and dates his popularity as a *Maccus* sometime before the outbreak of the Second Punic War. Plautus retired from the stage and invested his earnings in a mercantile venture which failed; he returned to Rome as a laborer (perhaps in a mill, although Buck, p. 23, considers this of little importance), and was already well on his career as a playwright at the beginning of the war. The increase in theatrical performances attests his popularity, as do the frequent *instaurationes*, which Buck explains (pp. 14 f.), not on religious grounds, but by the desire of the authorities to please the public. The fact that there were eight performances of the *ludi plebei* in 205 B. C. Buck attributes to the popularity of the *Miles Gloriosus*, usually dated in that year (p. 16). Much of this reconstruction is of course hypothetical, but Buck handles his material for the most part convincingly. I do not see the reason for assuming that *Bacch.* 214 f. is an actor's interpolation and that Plautus himself was playing the part of Chrysalus (p. 4, note; cf. p. 32, note, p. 66, note); one might equally well argue from the reference to Sarsina in *Most.* 770 that Plautus played the part of Tranio. The discussion of the union of Greek new comedy and native Italian farce (p. 22) could have been strengthened by reference to Little's recent paper on Plautus and popular drama.³

In the body of his work (pp. 25-104) Buck analyzes the plays of Plautus, calling to our attention all topical allusions that will aid in the dating and using metrical arguments where they seem most valid.⁴ It is impossible in a review to discuss his treatment of the individual plays. The author presents new material and after careful examination rejects or accepts older theories. His views on the *Amphitruo*, *Casina*, and *Menaechmi* seem particularly well presented; in the *Casina* he follows most scholars in accepting a late date against Mattingly and Robinson whose recent attempt to date the play early on numismatic evidence seems unfounded. At times Buck may see historical allusions in the text where none really exists; this is perhaps the case with the *Asinaria* and the *Bacchides*. The *Epidicus* may have been presented several years earlier than he assumes, for *Bacch.* 214 f. does not necessarily mean that the *Epidicus* must have been presented very shortly before (p. 67); the

³ A. M. G. Little, *Harv. Stud. Class. Philol.*, XLIX (1938), pp. 205-28.

⁴ Especially in the earlier plays; see pp. 75 f. For Buck's criticisms of Sedgwick on individual plays, cf. pp. 25, 43 f., 54, 61, 64, 67, 92, 102.

passage does not refer to the popularity of the *Epidicus*, but to Plautus' own fondness for it, and it does not follow that the *Epidicus* must therefore be later than the *Pseudolus* (p. 69); also, names like Thebes and Epidaurus need not indicate a date after the return of soldiers from Greece, i.e. after 194 B. C. (p. 68); Buck's arguments here seem particularly weak.

Perhaps Buck's most serious omission is his failure to consider Enk's treatment of the separate plays.⁵ Since Enk, a mature Plautine scholar, has worked from historical allusions and has thus used practically the same method as Buck, and since his work, written in Dutch, is perhaps less widely known than it deserves to be, I shall place their chronologies side by side for purposes of comparison:

Enk		Buck	
<i>Menaechmi</i>	ca. 215		
<i>Asinaria</i>	212		
<i>Mercator</i>	212		
<i>Rudens</i>	? (211-206)		
<i>Amphitruo</i>	207-206	<i>Asinaria</i>	207
<i>Miles Gloriosus</i>	206-204	<i>Mercator</i>	206
		<i>Miles Gloriosus</i>	205
<i>Cistellaria</i>	before 201	<i>Cistellaria</i>	202 (cf. p. 63)
<i>Stichus</i>	200	<i>Stichus</i>	200
<i>Mostellaria</i>	200-199		
<i>Epidicus</i>	196		
<i>Persa</i>	196		
<i>Curculio</i>	? (199-193)		
<i>Aulularia</i>	195		
<i>Trinummus</i>	194	<i>Aulularia</i>	194 or later
<i>Captivi</i>	193	<i>Curculio</i>	193 or later
		<i>Mostellaria</i>	193 or later
		<i>Poenulus</i>	191
<i>Pseudolus</i>	191	<i>Pseudolus</i>	191
<i>Bacchides</i>	190	<i>Epidicus</i>	190
<i>Truculentus</i>	189	<i>Bacchides</i>	189
		<i>Rudens</i>	189
		<i>Captivi</i>	188
<i>Poenulus</i>	187	<i>Trinummus</i>	187
		<i>Truculentus</i>	186
		<i>Amphitruo</i>	186
<i>Casina</i>	186 or 185	<i>Menaechmi</i>	186
		<i>Persa</i>	186
		<i>Casina</i>	184

Buck assigns the plays to a twenty-four year period but dates no plays between 200 and 194; fifteen plays are dated in the last decade of Plautus' life, four in the year 186. Enk has a thirty-year period with no interval of more than two or three years without a play. If Plautus began to write plays before the outbreak of the Second Punic War, as Buck assumes (pp. 19, 23), Enk's chronology would seem more probable; but Buck's arguments against an early date for the *Menaechmi* seem decisive, and, furthermore, he thinks that the earlier plays, having less of Plautus' originality and metrical innovations, were rejected by Roman critics. Five of the

⁵ See *supra*, note 1.

plays on the two lists agree (including of course the *Stichus*, *Pseudolus*, and *Miles Gloriosus*), five more are within two to four years, but of the remaining six are from five to seven years apart, in the case of one (*Persa*) there is a difference of ten years, the *Amphitruo* and the *Rudens* have dates on the two lists approximately twenty years apart, while there is a spread of thirty years for the *Menaechmi*. It is difficult not to be sceptical when one views these conclusions, reached independently by different scholars using similar methods.

It will perhaps be instructive to turn again to the lists of the plays based on different criteria and to include these studies in our consideration of the chronology since Buck has failed to do this. If we place side by side the chronologies of Püttner, Westaway, Sedgwick, Hough,⁶ Schneider, Enk, and Buck, it seems possible to arrive at the following definite conclusions. There are at least four plays which should be dated before 200, the year of the *Stichus*;⁷ these plays are the *Asinaria*, *Mercator*, *Cistellaria*, and *Miles Gloriosus*; all lists are in agreement here, with the partial exception of Schneider, whose method seems to lack validity.⁸ To the middle period between 200 and 191 (the date of the *Pseudolus*) belong the *Aulularia* and the *Curculio*, perhaps also the *Rudens* and the *Amphitruo*, although the last two are dated by Enk in the early period, by Buck in the late period. For the period after 191 there is complete agreement (again with the exception of Schneider) on the *Bacchides* and the *Casina*. There are thus twelve plays where the results of the different tests are in fair accord, not, to be sure, as to the exact year, but in the grouping of plays as early, middle, and late. The remaining eight plays (*Captivi*, *Epidicus*, *Menaechmi*, *Mostellaria*, *Persa*, *Poenulus*, *Trinummus*, *Truculentus*) seem considerably less certain, and in most cases the same play (e.g. *Epidicus*, *Mostellaria*, *Poenulus*) is dated by different tests as early, middle, and late.

Buck's dissertation is an important contribution to the study of Plautine chronology, and his views on the individual plays will deserve serious consideration in all future study of the problems. His dating of several of the plays can hardly stand, but, as he admits (p. 106), positive identification is extremely hazardous in many instances. It may be doubted if there are as many allusions to Scipio's career as he suggests; Buck at times appears to under-rate the Greek nature of the plot in his search for topical allusions.

⁶ Hough (*A. J. P.*, LV [1934], p. 361) gives the lists also of Püttner, Westaway, and Sedgwick, but somewhat inaccurately; Püttner dates the *Truculentus* about the time of the *Stichus* and places the *Trinummus* after the *Pseudolus*; also Hough presents Sedgwick's list of 1925 which is misleading, as Sedgwick revised his chronology at many points in 1930.

⁷ The *didascalia* which have survived for the *Stichus* and the *Pseudolus* make their dates certain. But cf. A. Boutemy, *Rev. Et. Anc.*, XXXVIII (1936), pp. 29-34, who considers our present *Stichus* a later reworking of the play, presented in 187 or 186. It is unfortunate that Buck ignores this article, since Boutemy uses for the *Stichus* the same method which Buck employs elsewhere.

⁸ See *supra*, note 2.

It is to be hoped that greater certainty concerning the date of many plays can be achieved by further investigation. Every important advance in our knowledge of the chronology has great value for a better understanding of the development of Plautus' dramatic technique.

GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

The Annual of the British School at Athens, No. XXXVII, Session 1936-37. Papers presented to Professor J. L. Myres in Honour of his 70th Birthday. London, Macmillan & Co., 1940. Pp. x + 286; 30 plates.

This volume of the *Annual*, published in honor of Professor Myres, contains twenty-nine articles on various subjects. It would be impossible within the compass of a review to discuss, however briefly, all this highly interesting material, and it becomes necessary to make a selection of those articles which in the reviewer's opinion seem especially important or otherwise provocative of comment.

Many of the articles are written by former pupils of Professor Myres and by scholars whose interest in the particular subject of their contribution has been aroused through comments, whether written or spoken, by the eminent scholar to whom the volume is presented. Consequently there is a preponderance of articles on subjects to which Professor Myres has made his most important contributions. The articles are arranged in alphabetical order according to the names of the authors.

In the second article of the series C. W. Blegen has set forth in a brief statement his conclusions with regard to a revised chronology of Trojan antiquities. In this way the immensely important material from the new excavations at Troy has been made available for use in comparative chronology in advance of the final publication.

In the subsequent article, first presented as a lecture during an Easter cruise in the Mediterranean, A. W. Brøgger compares the Greeks of the colonizing period to the Vikings of more than a millennium and a half later. He is of the opinion that the Greeks roamed farther afield than is generally assumed: that they circumnavigated Africa and landed on the Azores, that they went by sea as far north as Scandinavia and may well have reached the shores of the western hemisphere. However extravagant these claims may seem to scholars whose horizon is limited by the written word, it is important to bear in mind, as Brøgger points out, "that, in reality, most of the things which have happened in the long history of mankind have not been written down at all. This is one of the truths which gives archaeology its great advantage and power." The adventures of the Vikings, which were, like those of the Greeks, the concomitant results of colonial expansion, are discussed at some length by the author and compared to the enterprises of the Greek Viking age.

Professor V. G. Child discusses the stroke-burnished ware of Neolithic times, and on the basis of certain obvious similarities in

shapes and fabric he points to a continuous area of dispersion, reaching from Moravia to the Mediterranean and from Malta to the Euphrates. He wisely refrains from drawing any far-reaching conclusions of an ethnological nature but discusses the chronological data—or their absence—for the period concerned.

It is natural in a volume dedicated to Professor Myres that Cypriote and Oriental archaeology should occupy an important place among the contributed articles. An interesting amphora from Cyprus of the early Iron Age is minutely described by P. Dikaïos, and certain features of Cypriote conservatism are illustrated by the representations on the vase.

H. Frankfort discusses the origin and significance of the Cretan griffin and the distribution of the griffin motive in the Aegean and the East. Unknown to the Babylonians, the griffin became especially common after the middle of the second millennium when Assyria emerged as an independent center. It plays an important rôle in Mitannian as well as in Cretan and Egyptian art; but its primary source is to be sought in Syria, where it makes its earliest appearance and where it also survives the fall of the Minoan civilization.

C. F. C. Hawkes in a hyper-hyphenated article discusses the use and significance of the double axe in prehistoric times. He argues for the view that the double axe of stone, found in Central and Northern Europe, is derived, though indirectly and with some modifications, from the Cretan double axe of bronze. He even goes so far as to assert with confidence that not only the form but also the religious significance of the double axe spread from Crete to the west of Europe. Whatever may be said for or against the author's thesis, the terminology used throughout the article seems highly infelicitous. The following specimens picked at random suggest the linguistic flavor of the treatise: "the well-known drooping-bladed copper axe-adzes of East-Central Europe"; "the hammer-butted shaft-hole battle-axes"; "the displaced shaft-hole and tendency to hammer-buttedness"; and such alliterative delicacies as "Breton Bell-beaker folk" and "British B 1 beaker culture" are served up with reckless prodigality.

A highly significant series of solar discs, belonging to the pre-Hittite period, are discussed by H. Z. Kosay, the excavator of the necropolis at Alaca-Hüyük, where these objects came to light. The combinations of these discs or wheels with some animal figures, especially those of the bull and the stag, show beyond a doubt that they were not used merely or primarily as decorative designs but were certainly endowed with symbolical significance.

The article by J. D. S. Pendlebury on Lasithi in Crete is charmingly written and very informative, though some of his conclusions, set forth with modest reserve, are likely to be questioned. He says, for example, that the fringed style of pottery at the end of the thirteenth century coincides with the arrival of the Achaeans in Mainland Greece; and that the Dorians "brought with them Proto-geometric pottery—the use of iron, the practice of cremation in the place of inhumation, and some new style of dress which needed the use of the fibula." The most refreshing feature of the article is the author's belief in the continuity of human progress, and the

importance he attaches to the understanding of local conditions of the present time as a key to unlock many of the secrets of the past.

C. F. A. Schaeffer has contributed an article on a very fine krater from Ras Shamra, decorated with chariot scenes on both sides. The vase deserves this detailed stylistic study, but the author seems to me to go too far in trying to attribute mythological meaning to one of the scenes. The "chain" or "cord" by which the large bird seems to be tied round the neck could equally well be a long worm or a snake on the point of being swallowed (similarly on the sherd in fig. 26); or, what is more likely, a simple filling ornament, such as the painters of this class of vases applied in every available space. Would not an ostrich, like a chicken or goose, be tethered by the feet rather than the neck?

There are several articles on classical topics, the most significant of which seems to me to be M. N. Tod's new study of the Greek acrophonic numerals. This is in the nature of a summary of three earlier articles by the same author together with the addition of the new material that has appeared since these were published. It will be a welcome help to epigraphists and historians to have this difficult subject brought up to date by the author who has done so much to untangle many of its baffling intricacies.

Although archaeological articles predominate, there are several contributions on historical and philological subjects. Two of these, one by A. Andrewes and another by T. J. Dunbabin, have to do with Herodotus' account of the relations and the wars between Athens and Aegina. The early war with Aegina in which Athens was defeated, with the help of Argos, Dunbabin dates in the early seventh century, and more precisely in the reign of Pheidon. He connects the legislation about the size of pins with Pheidon's monetary reforms on the supposition that pins, like spits and hooks, had currency value before the introduction of silver money. The embargo on Attic pottery, used by others as evidence for the date of the war, Dunbabin takes to have been restricted to dedications in the sanctuary of Damia and Auxesia, the site of which has not yet been discovered. Archaeological evidence points to no period at which Attic pottery was not in common use in Aegina.

The later wars mentioned by Herodotus are discussed by A. Andrewes, who gives a chronological summary of the events affecting the relations of Athens and Aegina up to the time of their reconciliation in 481.

OSCAR BRONEER.

PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY.

The Annual of the British School at Athens, No. XXXVIII, Session 1937-38. London, Macmillan & Co., 1940. Pp. xii + 154; 35 plates.

In the thirty-sixth volume of the *Annual of the British School*, the late J. D. S. Pendlebury and Miss M. B. Money-Coutts published an extensive report on the exploration of the Plain of Lasithi, conducted by members of the school, and especially the results of the excavation of the cave of Trapeza. In the present volume are given

the results of further explorations of the plain and of the excavations conducted there in 1937 and 1938 by members of the British School led by the late J. D. S. Pendlebury, whose methodical work can be detected in every section of the report.

The first part of the volume (pp. 1-56), prepared by Pendlebury and Miss Money-Coutts, is devoted to the prehistoric remains found especially in the caves of Skaphidhia and Meskine and on the Kastellos. These seem to supplement the evidence obtained in the Cave of Trapeza and to prove that the famous cave fell into disuse as a dwelling-place by the beginning of E. M. II and was used only as a burial place in the ensuing M. M. period by the people who had settled in the open and especially at the site of Kastellos. This last site seems to have been abandoned after the M. M. III period. The pottery from this and adjacent sites is fully described as well as the few miscellaneous objects in terracotta and stone.

The second and longer part of the volume (pp. 57-145) is devoted to the description of the remains of the site of Karphi in the plain of Lasithi at a short distance from the modern village of Tzermiadho. The names of the authors are not given, because, as is stated on p. 59,

"Where all have worked towards the results, it seems best to preserve the anonymity of the contributors, particularly since every section is the work, if not of several hands, at least of several minds."

This noble gesture on the part of the authors of the report will be appreciated especially by all those who have toiled faithfully in the excavations of various sites but had no chance to contribute in the publication of the results. The site of Karphi dominates the easiest entrances into the plain of Lasithi, and at its prime it seems to have been occupied by a population of about 3,500 people. One-third of the site has been excavated, enough to give a clear picture of the ancient town. Its houses, built against each other, are separated by paved, winding roads. Some of them are of the "megaron type," while others seem to belong to simplified Minoan forms. Their remains are described and illustrated clearly and their appearance picturesquely restored on the basis of the evidence and of modern native practices. A temple, clearly Minoan in type, was also uncovered and among its debris were found some clay figurines of the Minoan Goddess. At a short distance from the site two groups of tombs were excavated, composed of a round or rectangular chamber and a processional *dromos*. The type of these vaulted tombs certainly is not Minoan. A good many of the objects discovered—those in metal, stone, and bone—are described and excellently illustrated. The publication of the clay objects and vases was deferred, since the vases especially could not have been mended by the end of the season of 1939 and made ready for publication.

An interesting account of the "Flowers of Lasithi" (pp. 146-48) is added by Peter H. Davis at the end of the report.

The history of the site is well established by the authors of the report. It seems that it was inhabited in the Intermediate Period (incidentally, the name is excellently chosen) *ca.* 1100-900 B. C., at the end of which it was abandoned. Its architecture presents Minoan

and non-Minoan elements. The "megaron type" of the houses and the "vaulted tombs" are the most important non-Minoan elements and they are attributed to the Achaeans. The city itself is believed to have been built by the Minoan people of the plain and their Achaean overlords, when they were forced to the hills by the Dorian invaders. In their new city they remained until the "first rush of the invasion had spent itself." Then they abandoned the site and descended to the plain once more.

The reviewer will find few things on which to comment in this splendid report. But there are a few points, perhaps minor, which could be brought forth. The reader will notice the omission of "dimensions" in the description of the houses and their parts; it is rather cumbersome to obtain these by referring each time to the scale in the plans. Perhaps the application of the Homeric term "megaron" to the main room of the house is unfortunate. It follows, however, a common practice, especially among scholars who work in Crete. Certainly the main room of the Homeric architectural unit was known as the "domos." Telemachus takes Athena, in the guise of Mentès, into the "domos" to entertain her. In the "domos," or main room, the suitors are feasting, and the "domoi" of Alcinoüs were filled with guests (*Odyssey*, a 126, 144; θ 57-58). The fact that the authors themselves use the term "prodomos" to indicate a vestibule in front of the main room will seem to indicate that the main room should be called a "domos." The term "megaron" should be used to indicate the entire unit composed of the "prodomos," "domos," and the "thalamos" (or of the first two only).

In their description the tombs are referred to as "tholoi," but no description is given of the construction of the vaulting. To judge from the "Ideal Composite Section" of plate XII, the corbel vaulting was used in their construction. One would wish to see a drawing of the incisions on the stone disc 438, before he could believe that they "illustrate the final and degenerate form of Minoan lettering" and the implications deduced from them. As for the significance of the "σήματα λυγρά," perhaps we may refer to Harland's "Scripta Helladica" (*A. J. A.*, XXXVIII [1934], p. 84) for the exact meaning of that Homeric passage. The history of the site and the rôle played by the Achaeans and Dorians are very interesting. One could assume, however, that the Lasithi plain was comparatively safe from invaders and that the so-called Achaean lords of Karphi would have felt the need of a temple of their own, as they seem to have felt the need of keeping their own grave types. Such a temple has not been located as yet.

In general the reports contained in the present volume are characterized by the high degree of accuracy and scholarly presentation which we have come to expect from the publications of the British School at Athens.

GEORGE E. MYLONAS.

WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY, ST. LOUIS.

HOMER A. THOMPSON. The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1940. Pp. v + 160; 3 plates; 105 text figs. \$5.00. (*Hesperia*, Supplement IV.)

When one considers the antiquity of the Tholos at Athens and its many centuries of service as a governmental building, its varied fortunes, the nature of its function, the fact that the majority of the male citizens of Athens, at least once in their lives, had spent a tenth of a year in most intimate association with it, and, finally, the peculiar style of its architecture, it seems a bit surprising that Greek literature reveals so little consciousness of its existence. We might with reason expect to find some witty allusion to the Tholos and its occupants in the writings of the comic poets, but at least no such allusion is now extant. Most of those for whom today the name has any meaning undoubtedly associate it with what Socrates has to say of having been summoned to the Tholos by the Thirty to receive instructions for the arrest of Leon of Salamis. Andocides relates that, in the excitement created by the mutilation of the Hermae, the prytanes were ordered to pass the night in the Tholos. Demosthenes twits Aeschines with having been supported there for two years at public expense while serving as grammateus. Aristotle records that the prytanes dined together in the Tholos, and that during his twenty-four hours in office the epistates, together with the third of his colleagues whom he selected for the purpose, was required to remain on duty there. Pausanias supplies the additional information that the prytanes offered certain sacrifices in (or at) the Tholos, and that there, too, were "certain silver images of no great size." This is all that Greek literature has to offer on the Tholos. The ancient lexicographers naturally were interested in the name, and from them we learn that a second name, Skias, i. e., Sunshade, was employed because of the peculiar form of the roof. Because this is the name which occurs in the inscriptions, we infer that it was the official designation. It should be added that inscriptions tell us that the Skias was the official repository for standard weights and measures.

As recently as 1930, Judeich, in the second edition of his *Topographie von Athen*, admitted that despite modern discussions and researches nothing new had been added to our knowledge of the Tholos and that the interior arrangement of the building was still obscure. Three years later, in the southwest corner of the Agora, the American excavators began uncovering the remains of a circular structure which obviously must be identified with the Tholos. In the next campaign that area was completely laid bare, and in 1937 and 1938 Thompson, supplementing the previous discoveries of his colleague, Eugene Vanderpool, explored the lower levels of the Tholos and its immediate neighborhood, thereby securing evidence not only for a reconstruction of that building and for an understanding of some at least of its vicissitudes through its long history but also regarding certain structures of an earlier age which it displaced. The scope of the study under review is best presented in the author's own words: "The present report is little more than an

attempt to present the evidence for the reconstruction and history of the buildings. The epigraphic and literary evidence bearing on the Tholos has been discussed repeatedly and at length by others. Detailed consideration of the historical significance of the new material had best wait until the excavation of the Agora, and of the North Slope, is more nearly complete."

Even with these limitations Supplement IV constitutes a not inconsiderable contribution to the *Hesperia* publications. Pages 3-44 are devoted to the description and interpretation of architectural remains in the immediate neighborhood of the Tholos and anterior to it in date; in pages 44-92 will be found a detailed analysis of the Tholos proper: its location, state of preservation, plan, and kindred topics; next are treated such matters of interest as the monuments within the Tholos precinct, water supply, and roads and drains; this is followed by a brief survey of the chronology of the Tholos, a discussion of the cults associated with it, a report on miscellaneous finds which shed light on the purpose and use of the building, a brief statement regarding its identification and purpose, and a final note on the identification of Bouleuterion and Metroon. Appended to the text are a very welcome chronological index covering the history of the site from neolithic times to the present day, a general index, and three plates. Interspersed throughout the text are abundant photographs and drawings serviceable in elucidating what is necessarily a very intricate problem.

Thompson's investigations of the Tholos region reveal that it was occupied as early as the Middle Helladic period, but its dedication to administrative purposes dates from the first quarter of the sixth century, at which time there was erected, slightly to the north of the site of the later Tholos, the first of three buildings (C, D, and E) to which he has applied the label, "Primitive Bouleuterion." This earliest building (C), though too small to have served as a place of meeting, might well have housed records of the Boule, official seals, and similar equipment. It takes us back to the time of Solon, who is reputed to have founded the Council of Four Hundred. D, erected shortly afterward, faced C across an open court. It ultimately contained three rooms of unequal size, and Thompson regards it as the domestic establishment of the early prytanes. Cuttings in the rock to the west of these two buildings suggest that here in the open air were held the meetings of Solon's Boule. We are told little of the arrangement and function of Building E, the remains of which are extremely scanty, but it lay between C and D and is clearly of later date. All three buildings were displaced in the last decade of the sixth century by the "Old Bouleuterion," a large rectangular structure covering not only most of the space once occupied by its predecessors but also ground to the west and south.

South of this area, and including most of the site of the later Tholos, we come upon an elaborate complex of rooms (Building F) about a colonnaded court of irregular pattern, the largest archaic building in this region. The western portion seems to have consisted of kitchen and storerooms. Immediately to the south are the remains of a small structure which Thompson identifies as a bake-house, and to the north, approached from a corridor between

storerooms and kitchen, are two ancient "broiling pits," the earlier of which measures 6.75 m. in length, about 0.70 m. in width, and about 0.65 m. in depth. This whole western section is viewed as a unit and called the domestic quarter; the eastern section, with its pretentious court and adjoining rooms, is regarded as designed for living and dining purposes. A small rectangular structure, fitting into space left vacant at the southwest corner of F and apparently of contemporary date, may have served as a chapel. Thus Building F and its several annexes are roughly equated by Thompson with D, just as they in turn gave way to the Tholos.

As if to repair the inadequacy of the written record, the Tholos is today "one of the best preserved buildings of the Agora." As has always been known, it is a circular building, but its dimensions prove to be larger than had been supposed. Whereas, on the basis of computations suggested by its use as a dining hall to accommodate the fifty prytanes and certain supernumeraries, Fiechter had allowed an inner diameter of slightly more than 15 m., the actual diameter proves to be 16.9 m.

The original plan of the building involved "a solid outer wall, a doorway toward the east, possibly another toward the north, and six interior columns for the support of the roof." Eight blocks of the lowest course of the wall remain *in situ*, and one block of the second course. Stumps of five of the six columns are still in place, and it is seen that they were not concentric with the encompassing wall but so placed as to form a broad open space from north to south. The original floor of trodden earth in course of time was succeeded by mosaic pavement, both now being hidden by a still later pavement of marble slabs bedded in concrete, thirty-one of the slabs being still in place. Many fragments of the original roof-tiles of terracotta were found in the fill all about the building. The problem of reconstructing the roof from which they came presents much difficulty, but Thompson is convinced that it had no lantern, and he finds confirmation for his view in the name *Skias*. At least four centuries subsequent to the construction of the Tholos, a porch was added on the east, precisely in line with the east-west axis of the building.

Adjoining the Tholos on the north, and directly above the ancient "broiling pits," are the remains of a rectangular annex, contemporary with the Tholos itself, and identified as the kitchen of the prytanes. The identification is made the more plausible through the presence of a capacious drain that seemingly served the structure. Presumably the wall of the Tholos facing the kitchen was provided with a special doorway through which the servants passed to serve the diners. Another annex, in direct contact with the west wall of the Tholos but having no communicating doorway, was divided into two narrow compartments. Thompson suggests with some hesitancy that it may have served to house either domestic equipment of the Tholos or the standard weights and measures which were in the keeping of the prytanes.

The original construction of the Tholos can be assigned with reasonable certainty to approximately 470 B. C., inasmuch as the buildings which it displaced, and in part overlay, are known to have been renovated in 479 and sherds recovered from a pit dug close

to the Tholos at a date subsequent to its construction provide the year 460 as a *terminus ante quem*.

The story of the varying fortunes of the Tholos through its career of roughly one thousand years, briefly summarized in pages 132-37, is at once a tribute to the careful observation and learning of the archaeologist who made the story intelligible and a reminder of the many exciting events in the long history of the city which it served: party strife and insurrection, rivalry between Macedonian overlords, Roman pillage and vandalism, barbarian incursion and destruction. Again and again, after the turmoil had ended, the building was restored, until at last, for some unknown reason, sometime in the fifth century of our era the prytanes abandoned it to decay. Thompson finds reason for believing that they migrated a few yards northward to the Metroon, which had been built in Hellenistic times above the ruins of Building D, "to spread their common tables once more precisely in the spot where they had begun to dine together a round thousand years before."

In concluding his report Thompson speaks briefly of several subsidiary matters, some of which may be noticed here. In late Roman fill close to the Tholos there was found a small marble plaque with an inscription referring to the plants of certain deities called *ταῖς Πωσφόροις* (*sic*). A priest of these deities had been named in an inscription belonging to the middle of the first century B. C., and though he had some official connection with the Tholos is to be inferred from an additional phrase found in later inscriptions. The chief contribution of our new evidence is the information that the gods in question were female. They may have been associates of Artemis Boulaia, long known from inscriptions and named on a stone found in the neighborhood of the Tholos in the campaign of 1934. Thompson is inclined to identify with her a small statue found in the near neighborhood beneath the floor of a late Roman house which intruded upon the Tholos precinct. Though the Phosphoroi are not yet clearly known, they may have been included among the unspecified deities referred to in prytany decrees which mention sacrifices offered preliminary to meetings of the Ecclesia. That the prytanes should have had their own rites is what we might have expected, even without the express testimony of both Demosthenes and Pausanias.

Another decree, datable in the year 191-0 B. C., records the services of a committee appointed by the Boule to replenish the equipment of the Tholos and to inspect and inventory drinking vessels, tripods, etc. We seem to learn from the document that furnishings had been donated by Queen Laodice, wife of Antiochus III, and by some king, presumably Antiochus himself. Thompson points out that a natural inference would be that the cheap table-ware, found in abundance about the Tholos, gave way on state occasions to richer equipment. Another point of interest is the fact that, although the inscription, as usual, employs the term *Skias* in speaking of the building, the adjective applied to the fund from which the committee made its purchases is derived from the word *tholos*.

In concluding this survey of Thompson's work, the reviewer confesses that he has done scant justice to its contents. It has been his purpose to single out for mention chiefly those features which

might have the widest appeal. Thompson has left no stone unturned in making his study and he has reported his findings with his usual meticulous care. His results may not have overthrown many accepted ideas regarding the Tholos, but they do constitute a vivid and consistent picture of an institution regarding which previously there have been only the haziest notions based upon the scantiest of testimony. There should no longer be any excuse for a scholar's equating Tholos with Prytaneum, as the reviewer found to be the case in a recent publication. There seems to be slight occasion for adverse criticism of the work before us. It is abundantly documented with plans and photographs, careful examination of which is essential to an understanding of the argument, and only one misprint caught the eye of the reviewer. He did, however, have some doubts as to the adequacy of the statement printed on p. 44: "The round shape of the building is happily suited to the angle of the ancient roadway and may indeed have been suggested by the exigencies of the site." So violent a departure from the form and arrangement of the buildings which the Tholos replaced would seem to call for some other explanation than the exigencies of the site.

H. LAMAR CROSBY.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

H. JEANMAIRE. *Couroi et Courètes. Essai sur l'éducation spartiate et sur les rites d'adolescence dans l'antiquité hellénique.* Lille, Bibliothèque Universitaire, 1939. Pp. 638. (*Travaux et Mémoires de l'Université de Lille*, XXI.)

Jeanmaire's book is a long one, and the first hundred pages or so are not reassuring, but I found that it became more and more interesting as I read on, until, when I had finished it, I was convinced that Jeanmaire had made an extremely valuable contribution to our knowledge of antiquity. Perhaps his book is too long, but much of his argument requires the elaboration that he gives it.

The title may be misleading, for the book delves into a vast area of religion, folklore, and social institutions. The classes of Homeric society, African initiation-rites, Tom Thumb, Theseus and the Minotaur, Lycurgus, werewolves and leopard societies, these are but a few of the subjects that Jeanmaire finds it necessary to study in detail in the development of his theme.

Through a study of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* he proves that the earliest Greek societies were organized in much the same way as those of the African continent today, where many features of the ancient Mediterranean culture still survive. Fundamental were the age-classes: *paides*, *kouroi*, *gerontes*. Of tremendous importance, as his study of African societies shows, was the transition from childhood to young manhood, when the boy became a *kouros*, entitled to full participation in community life as warrior and citizen. This transition involved a period of seclusion, lasting several months, when the boys were hazed through ordeals of various kinds and taught all the traditional wisdom of the community. There were many features to

this period of seclusion. To mention but a few: frightful masked figures tormented the boys, but were finally unmasked; boys were dressed as girls part of the time; there were weird symbolic rites in which the boys died, went to the realm of the dead or of the gods, and were born again to a new life. There were corresponding rites for the girls.

These age-classes and initiation-rites of primitive Greek society left many traces in classical Greek society. They can be seen in the customs of the Apaturia, Thesmophoria, Oschophoria, Stepteria, and numerous other festivals, and in the whole structure of the Spartan community. Many myths have their origin in initiation-rites; for instance, Theseus and the Minotaur, the rape of Persephone, Apollo and the Python, the birth of Zeus on Dictæ. Not that Jeanmaire believes that initiation-rites are the one and only explanation of the phenomena that he adduces; but he proves that they throw light on much that has hitherto been obscure.

This is but the baldest statement of Jeanmaire's position. It can be appreciated only through a careful reading of the book. I am convinced that his method is sound and fruitful. He belongs to that group of students who find the roots of a people's religion and mythology in their social and political institutions. And to those classicists who may be frightened away by Jeanmaire's use of evidence from darkest Africa I can say that he has used the comparative method with wisdom and caution.

No doubt Jeanmaire has made mistakes in details. I, for one, could wish that he had avoided two ancient errors: he talks about earlier and later parts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and about Apollo as a sun-god in early times (p. 280). But minor errors do not affect the validity of his general thesis.

The book is provided with an adequate index, bibliography, index locorum, and table of contents.

JOSEPH FONTENROSE.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

JÉRÔME CARCOPINO. *Daily Life in Ancient Rome*. Translated by E. O. LORIMER. Edited with Bibliography and Notes by H. T. ROWELL. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xv + 342.

This belated review is intended not so much to call the attention of readers of the *A. J. P.* to Carcopino's book, which will be known to all, as to add one more deserved encomium to the many already bestowed upon it by earlier reviewers.

The volume is one of a popular French series, written by different authors on the daily life of a civilized people at some great moment in their history, and it has all the advantages of concentration upon the time of Trajan, with the necessary reflections upon the days immediately preceding and following. The distinguished author focuses a bright light upon a time and place of brilliant achievement in human history.

Enthusiasm for Rome pervades all of these pages and there is an uninterrupted flow of lucid writing that will, I think, capture all readers—lay and learned alike. The book has stylistic distinction

and rests on great learning. It is immensely interesting, it has speed, color, and imagination; at the same time one will be using Carcopino side by side with Friedlaender, for its erudition. The two qualities of brilliant authorship and scholarship are fused,—to make a mine of information a living book.

Complete mastery of all of the many phases of ancient life discussed here may lie beyond the competence of one scholar or of one reviewer, but Carcopino has provided Notes and References to the original sources and to the learned literature that will provide the student with a background of information and discussion on myriad problems open to a variety of different interpretations. Dissent at many points is probably inevitable in the case of an independent and provocative work, such as this is. But Carcopino is entitled to his own considered and mature judgments, and the careful reader's numerous marginal questionmarks accumulate not so much for purposes of criticism as for future reference, for his own later confirmation or for confutation.

To illustrate: the pages on "The Decay of Traditional Religion" are written with characteristic spirit and with penetrating observations, while the pages that follow, on "The Progress of Oriental Mysticism" and on Christianity, rise to real eloquence. But, impressive as these pages on the pagan worship are and apparently convincing, they leave many doubts in my mind. Carcopino overemphasizes, I think, the lack of personal religion in pagan Rome; the note that is struck at the outset (p. 121) is repeated at the close of the book (p. 276). But we must remember the ancient use of the words *pater* and *mater* in addressing divinity, as an indication of the presence and force of a personal feeling in Roman pagan religious institutions and practices. A feeling of personal relationship existed in domestic worship, just as long as the cult of the Lares and Penates was valid. Readers of Sallust's *Catiline* will not have failed to find it there. The *Aeneid* gives us striking proof of such a close, personal relationship between worshipper and God, whether in the use of the phrase *animis inlabere nostris* (*Aen.*, III, 89) or, even, in the mockery of *Aen.*, I, 407-9. Nor is it true, I think, that the old, traditional religion had lost its power over the human heart. The State cults, after Caligula and Nero, may not have had the power to awaken enthusiasm and patriotism as they did in the days of Augustus, but the worship of the individual had not died, and peasant and philosopher clung to beliefs that were, in varying degrees, a composite of tradition and speculation, but they were still effective. The apparent indifference to moral values in the history of Roman religion may easily be overemphasized and this has been done repeatedly in the past. But it might be well to recall the triple alliance of virtues and loyalties in the old significance of *pietas*—despite Lucretius' condemnation of what he believed that word meant to many of his contemporaries. And Jupiter's crowning epithet of *Optimus Maximus* cannot have lost all of its moral values, in spite of the absence of a Decalogue in the organization of religious beliefs and practices. The example of the Vestals and the cult of the *Fides* were lessons in ethics. The pictures of divine intrigue that appear in the *Aeneid* may suggest a divorce of religion and ethics and may shock the modern reader, but an illuminat-

ing essay still remains to be written on *Vergil's* conception of the relation of *religiosus* to *bonus*. It is hardly fair to single out the festival of Anna Perenna, as typical of Roman festivals and their meaning to the pious. The *Terminalia* of Ovid's *Fasti* will occur to anyone as illustrative of a different sort of religious experience, probably still regarded by many with reverence in the Empire period. Carcopino emphasizes certain aspects of the beginning of Juvenal's XIIth Satire, but it might well be argued that these aspects which appear so prominently here are but the background of an unexpressed, affectionate regard for deities who, in this place, required no further expression of devotion than is implied in the sufficiently eloquent phrases, "Queen of Heaven" and "Tarpeian Jove," with all that these terms implied or evoked. Juvenal's rejection of belief in a lower world of punishments is no proof of his disregard of all mythologies or of orthodox worship. Skepticism there undoubtedly was in the minds of all thinking Romans but Petronius' account of the ceremony of the *nudipedalia* is poor evidence to prove that. There is plenty of agonized skepticism even in the *Aeneid*! Skepticism and reverence often go hand in hand. In the next place, Carcopino does not make out a case of indifference or of real lack of orthodox faith either for Tacitus or for Pliny. Much more space would have been required for that. Tacitus' well-known account of the Jews (*Hist.*, V, 5) does *not* "praise" their belief in one eternal and supreme God—even if he had done so, that need not have implied forgetfulness of Stoic rationalization, which, in Rome, balanced Oriental conviction and belief in monotheism,—while Tacitus' *Germania* reflects merely a natural sympathy for an ancient primitive belief which Tacitus could properly respect and even admire, all the more as Roman orthodox paganism had deep affiliations with the numinism of German worship in the forest. As for Pliny, Carcopino again overemphasizes certain factors in Pliny's account (*Epist.*, IX, 39) which appear in the foreground—but they do not imply a lack of belief in local cults and divinities or of love for them; for Pliny wished, primarily, to write his friend, the architect, of the colonnade, and there was no occasion or, at least, no need to dwell on the respect or reverence he may have felt for rites and gods. Even Ovid might be cited as an example of a Roman whose sophistication did not dull his love of simple ritual that had a powerful appeal in which age, folklore, and "religion" all played a part. We find evidence of Pliny's deeper devotion in other letters. Likewise the letter about Pliny's election to the augural college (*Epist.*, IV, 8) does not prove the "indifference" to the rites that Carcopino attaches to it. It would have been quite extraordinary if Pliny had, here, seized an opportunity to appear as un-Roman mystic, jubilant and ecstatic over the "incomparable privilege" of interpreting signs of the Divine Will. To dismiss Pliny's real feelings as "wholly worldly" or as those of a more or less cynical courtier is unfair, I believe, to the believer that Pliny essentially was.

As for the wane of the imperial cults, that is as effectively presented as could be done, in the space of a few pages. No one would quarrel with the thesis that this cult rapidly lost its power over the mind or the conscience of the common people. But the

continued hold of the old Roman religion and an awareness of the need of association of religion with *Virtus* can still readily be seen not only in pages of Cicero and Horace but also, later, in passages of Juvenal, Persius, and Statius, such as are cited on p. 134, or in the superb prayer of the Stoic, recorded by Seneca (see n. 125, p. 301). Such passages present the reverse side of the scene which Carcopino has chosen to present with all of the skill of his scholarship from his point of view, as the correct one.

Carcopino has made an immense field of knowledge his own, and his presentation of many phases of Roman private life, set forth in nine chapters and 276 pages, packed with information, carries the marks of his individual originality, interpretation, and mastery throughout.

The French edition has no illustrations, but Dr. Rowell, the editor of the American edition, has increased the value of the book for American readers by his addition of 23 carefully chosen illustrations. An invaluable Index, also, has been added to the text in the American edition. I can write of the work of the editor with appreciation and feeling. Rowell's chapter on "Sources of Information" is the work of a learned scholar, whose discrimination and own wide command of all of this material is further amply demonstrated in the "Notes." He has increased the number of these by about 250, and many of them have been expanded in order to bring Carcopino's Notes as up to date as possible. I have found many corrections of original references as given in the French edition. The editor has also revised the text at a number of points in order to present more complete and precise descriptions of the problems discussed. All of this work was a labor of love, and all the more commands our admiration and gratitude.¹

GEORGE DEPUE HADZSITS.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

WILLIAM KELLY PRENTICE. *The Ancient Greeks. Studies toward a Better Understanding of the Ancient World.* Princeton Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xi + 254. \$3.00.

This readable and interesting book deals only with certain loosely connected aspects of Greek history, Greece before the Greeks, When the Greeks became a People, The Earliest Greeks, Tyrants and the Emancipation of Men's Minds, The Persian Wars, Absolute Democracy, the World War of 431-404 B. C., Thucydides the Historian, The Lost Opportunity, World Empire. The treatment of the tyrants and of Thucydides is excellent, but in general there are no new interpretations such as are mentioned in the preface. In fact, much

¹Errata that I have found are the proper subject of personal correspondence, I think, and are, in the main, such as can hardly have been avoided in view of the wide scope of the work and the many references. They are a reflection on the scholarship of neither Author nor Editor.

is reprinted, sometimes with slight revisions, from previous articles¹ by Prentice (*T. A. P. A.*, LI [1920], pp. 5-18; LVI [1925], pp. 162-71; *Class. Phil.*, XXII [1927], pp. 399-408; XXV [1930], pp. 117-27; *Jahresh.*, XXXI [1938], pp. 36-41), with no mention of this fact or of Prentice's authorship of the articles. In chap. VI much is reprinted from Prentice's article of more than twenty-five years ago in the *Unpopular Review*, V (1916), pp. 332-48, with no mention of the article. The book is based mainly on German sources and, though the result of forty years' teaching, it often shows memory of lectures of years ago by his former professor, Eduard Meyer, which he heard when a student at Halle (I heard them both at Halle and at Berlin). When Meyer is quoted, the reference is to the antiquated 1901-1903 edition and not to the second edition of *Die Geschichte des Altertums* (1935-1937). Beloch also is often cited, though without quotation marks (pp. 69, 89-91), and on p. 89 "as it seems to me" should be "as it seems to Beloch." Professor Prentice is very skeptical and in general discredits the authority of ancient authors, though he accepts the Draconian Constitution as given in Aristotle's *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (chap. IV). Often he uses such phrases as "incredibly foolish" and "childish." So with regard to Miltiades' waiting for his turn at Marathon Professor Prentice seems to be prejudiced against democracy. "Absolute democracy is as vicious as absolute monarchy" (p. 152) and leads to "the unrestricted power of the largest class of voters, the most thoughtless, the most bigoted, and the most irresponsible." "Nor was freedom of mind promoted in any large degree by democratic institutions. The perfect fruit of democracy seems to be standardization, which is a blight upon individuality" (p. 92). Page 143 speaks of "absolute power to those who were the most unfit to make important decisions, who had as little education and knowledge of large affairs as they had of property, who had no stake to lose, no hostages, who were commonly unintelligent, unreasoning and easily led by demagogues and spellbinders." Or again (p. 145), "Many, if not most of them, were ignorant, shortsighted, and incapable of reasoned judgment: some of them were altogether thoughtless, reckless and violent." These are harsh criticisms in view of what the Greeks did in literature, philosophy, and art, and in view of Pericles' retiring disposition and honest politics, far removed from spellbinding. Nor were the masses vain and greedy (pp. 150, 151). No city of the same size in the same time has produced so many intelligent men as Athens. Thucydides (II, 65, 5) was right when he said that in the time of Pericles Athens became very great (*μεγίστη*), which Prentice (p. 152) wrongly interprets as the "best government in all its history." In general Professor Prentice disapproves of Pericles. "The policy of Pericles led his people into a disastrous war, and the political changes . . .

¹ This review was written immediately after the appearance of Professor Prentice's book but because of an abundance of reviews could not be printed earlier. I find that Professor W. F. McDonald also calls attention to this reprinting in *A. H. R.*, XLVII (1942), pp. 569-70. See now "Communications" of Prentice and McDonald in *A. H. R.*, XLVIII (1942), pp. 223-24.

made Athens after his death incapable of winning the war." But Thucydides (II, 65, 5-9) thinks otherwise, and he had a better chance to judge of Pericles than Professor Prentice. Thucydides is not so vague (p. 155) and does discuss definitely the causes of the war (p. 199). Thucydides makes much of the economic causes of the war and describes vividly the plague as a cause of Athens' failure to win the war, subjects sadly neglected by Prentice (cf. Smith, *Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, LI [1941], pp. 267-301, and now J. H. Finley's *Thucydides*). Probably Thucydides was present on many occasions when Professor Prentice thinks he was absent (p. 202).

The account of Homer or no Homer and of the Homeric Question, and the denial of Homer's historicity are unsatisfactory (p. 4, n. 3, for "Achians," read Achaeans). It will not please the "Unitarians." There is decided evidence on almost all important early sites in Greece for a great change in forms of houses, burial customs, pottery, etc., about 2000 B. C. Few archaeologists would say "there is no convincing evidence of any sort" (p. 6) for the change from Early Helladic to Middle Helladic. The change could not be due to "internal dissensions" (p. 7). The description of the bathroom at Tiryns is misleading (pp. 12, 13). There was no soap or shampoo, no "Turkish bath," and to say that "it requires no tub" shows ignorance of the terracotta bathtub found by Schliemann. On the grave stelae of Mycenae (p. 14) the chariots really have two men, but one has dismounted and is in front ready to fight. The purpose of the chariot was to carry the warrior to the battle and not to fight from. The art is typically Mycenaean and not "distinct from the Mycenaean" (p. 15). But then Prentice believes (p. 27) that the Mycenaean were not Greeks of any kind. The discussion of Tholoi is bad and would have profited by a reading of such articles as Pfuhl, "Zur Geschichte des Kurvenbaus" (*Ath. Mitt.*, XXX [1905], pp. 331-74). More than "a little of its circular foundation" of the tholos in Athens has been found (*Hesperia*, Supplement IV), and to say (p. 18) that "the best preserved one is at Eleusis" is careless, since there is none at Eleusis. In note 20 occurs the same mistake, where Epidauros and not Eleusis must be meant. The silver bowl (p. 20) is a rhyton and, though broken before put in Grave IV at Mycenae, was much more complete than Prentice believes, since many more fragments were found and published by Staïs, *Ath. Mitt.*, XL (1915), pp. 45-52, 112, Pls. VII-VIII. The new fragments show that an enemy is landing by boat and the city is defending itself against an attack from the sea. Schliemann, Staïs, and Tsountas are to be preferred to Bury, who had no authority for attributing the rhyton to "one of the rock-tombs." On one of the Vaphio cups a bull is not "goring a hunter" but a lady toreador has her legs around the bull's horns. The description of the Tiryns frescoes (p. 22) is not entirely accurate (see now Duell-Gettens, "A Review of the Problem of Aegean Wall Painting," *Technical Studies, Fogg Art Museum*, X [1942], pp. 190 ff.). The throne in the Palace of Minos is not at the end of the council chamber (p. 29) but in the middle. There is little about the Palace of Minos and its wonderful works of art. It is said (p. 28) that from 2000 to 1660 B. C. "a Minoan kingdom flourished in central Crete, the kings of which were perhaps at least nominally

vassals of the Egyptian sovereigns." The Cretans at this time were vassals of no other nation. Few, if any, Mycenaean objects have been found in Macedonia. The discussion of Greek colonization is weak, and I find no reference to Burn's good article, "Dates in Early Greek History" (*J. H. S.*, LV [1935], pp. 130-46) or to his book, *The World of Hesiod* (1936). There is no reference to Hecataeus, who is important for early history and genealogies (p. 45), nor to other logographers such as Xanthus, Charon, Hellanicus, who with Hecataeus were ably treated by Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* (1939). According to Prentice, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* existed in written form in the sixth century B. C. (p. 42), and writing "was not introduced among the Greeks until the eighth century B. C." What about the writing on tablets of the twelfth century B. C. found at Pylos, which may prove to be Greek in Cretan characters? In any case this is writing in Greece before 700 B. C. For the inscription on the Dipylon jug (pp. 42-43), which might be of the eighth century, and with regard to which it is not so uncertain "where or when the vase itself was made," better references could be given to *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIII (1918), p. 141; *Arch. Anz.*, XXXVI (1921), pp. 339-44; *A. J. A.*, XXXVIII (1934), p. 27; *Mus. Belge*, XXXVII (1923), pp. 307-9; *Klio*, XVII (1921), pp. 262 f., 267; and to Rodney Young (*Hesperia*, Supplement II, p. 228), who there wrongly says that the inscription is not Attic.

Not all ancient traditions agree in assigning Homer "to the eastern side of the Aegean." Salamis, Argos, Athens, Egyptian Thebes, Thessaly, Ithaca, Pylos, even Rome (Suidas), etc., are mentioned in ancient epigrams or by Lucian. Prentice is skeptical of much in Homer. "It is hardly conceivable that in the Homeric Age the siege of a town could have lasted more than a few months" (p. 49). In view of what male and female toreadors did at Cnossus to make a Minoan holiday, there is no impossibility, as Prentice thinks, in imagining (p. 55) a man leaping from horse to horse, as described in *Iliad*, XV, 679-86. On the same page Eugammon is spelt with one m. Tyrtæus (p. 58) is dated in the seventh century and said to come from Miletus, and the story of the lame Athenian schoolmaster going to Sparta to help with his marching songs is not told. Prentice thinks it only probable that there was a first Messenian War and that "we have no reliable information about it." Plato (*Laws* 629 A) certainly believed that Tyrtæus was an Athenian. Bowra (*Early Greek Elegists*, pp. 40-42) says, "There are good reasons for believing that he was born and bred a Spartan. . . . He lived, beyond question, at the time of the Second Messenian War." Some have even dated him in the fifth century. There is more than one colossal statue (p. 71) of Ramses II at Abu Simbel with Greek inscriptions. Prentice is unfamiliar with the contributions made to history by the excavations at Olynthus. The Chalcidic League, or State as I should prefer to call it, started about 432 B. C., not in the fourth century, and was not dissolved in 379 B. C. by Sparta. Sparta captured Olynthus but allowed it to keep its autonomy and government, which became even stronger, as the coins show, with eleven names of magistrates from 379 to 348 B. C. Rather than point out further peculiarities, I should like to protest against the idea (p. vii) that "not much new information about

Greek antiquity has been acquired in the last century." What about the contributions of Dinsmoor, Dow, Kolbe, McGregor, Meritt, Raubitschek, Wade-Gery, West, Wilhelm, and others to our knowledge of Greek history? What about the Tribute Lists, especially for the early years and for the assessment of 425/4, where there is space for the names of at least 388 cities to be restored. These give more information on many points than Thucydides, who says nothing about Cleon's increase in the assessment of the Empire. It would almost seem as if Thucydides himself was unfamiliar with their details. If Prentice had studied carefully recent researches, his book would have been much better. He would, for example, not have said (p. 108) that the Persians "did not dare to attempt a landing" at Phalerum after the battle of Marathon. So Herodotus, but archaeology and epigraphy prove that they brought their ships close into shore and attempted to land (*Hesperia*, IX [1940], pp. 56-59; cf. also Aristophanes, *Wasps*, 1079 f.; *Classical Studies Presented to Edward Capps*, p. 75). The history of Phyle and Thrasylbulus is certainly better understood since Raubitschek's restoration of the stele set up for the Heroes of Phyle (*Hesperia*, X [1941], pp. 284-95). I could cite many other examples, but it is certain that archaeology has added much new material² and that it also has verified and supplemented many ancient literary accounts of which philologists had denied the reliability.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

The *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus Translated into English Verse with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes and an Appendix of New Notes on the Text by ARCHIBALD Y. CAMPBELL. London, Hodder & Stoughton Ltd.; University Press of Liverpool, 1940. Pp. xxi + 95. 3s. 6d.

There are many translations of the *Agamemnon*, "probably on the whole the greatest spiritual work of man," as Swinburne said. It is like nothing else in literature, "simple and strange, grave and sensational, ornate and stiff," says Campbell. But we must read the Greek so as really to understand and enjoy the *Agamemnon*. As Mrs. Humphrey Ward said: "I shall never forget the first time when in middle life I read in the Greek the *Agamemnon*. The feeling of sheer amazement at the range and power of human thought . . . which a leisurely and careful reading of that play awakened in me, left deep marks behind." It will never be possible to convey in a translation all the great qualities of the *Agamemnon*, which has had a tremendous influence on later drama down to O'Neill's *Mourning Becomes Electra*.

² Cf. now also Rostovtzeff, "How Archaeology aids History," *Yale Review*, XXXI (1942), pp. 713-29; Dinsmoor, "The Correlation of Greek Archaeology with History," in *Studies in the History of Culture, The Disciplines of the Humanities . . . presented to W. G. Leland*, pp. 185-216.

The play has been often performed with great success in Greek in modern times. I have witnessed it at Athens and twice at Cambridge, Mass. (June 16th and 19th, 1906, when Professor Goodwin published a good prose translation with the Greek on the right-hand page and English on the left—an arrangement reversed by the Loeb Classical Library). The performance at Cambridge, England was in May, 1921, and the present translation of Campbell, based on his own revised Greek text of 1936, was acted at the University of Liverpool on the 17th and 18th of February, 1939.

The introduction contains some facts about Aeschylus and his humanistic appeal to modern times. "For in this country, at all events, the principles of liberty, of humanity, of justice based upon reason and tempered with mercy, exercise as strong an appeal as ever; and they are principles that for modern Europe are now in greater jeopardy than they have perhaps ever been. Indeed they are causes which, like all best things, not only require constant renewal if they are to be preserved in undiminished vigour, but have their existence only by and in such revitalisation." Then follow two cautions about the *Agamemnon*, that its ultimate theme is virtually the establishment among mankind of the Rule of Law and "the pace of an Aeschylean play is leisurely, and between these crises are long passages of poetic and rhetorical embroidery, serving partly to disclose the previous history of immediate issues, partly to comment upon the actual developments of the dramatic action." In section III Campbell discourses on the aims and methods of his translation. He proposes to produce something which should sound like the original, deviating from the original, if necessary, to preserve features more important. Besides sonority Campbell tries to keep in view the reader and to re-create by hook and by crook an immediate and direct intelligibility to an audience. Campbell succeeds in giving us rhythm, euphony, and cadence, even in his blank verse renderings of the iambic trimeters. He also indulges in rhetoric, and the *Agamemnon* is rhetorical and robustly rhythmical. Each little wave has a swell, a smooth back, and a tiny splash. The waves must not merely slap and slop and surely must not be dry sand. Campbell seems not to have attained his aims but has produced an excellent translation or paraphrase, diluting and dilating the original 1673 lines of Greek into 2064 English verses. Why put in such lines as "O, never fear! / This marine product stretches for thy feet" (1135-6)? There should be some sort of metrical conformity to the original in length and number of verses. Ideas in the original should be retained and ideas not in the original should be excluded. The poetical translations of Browning and Fitzgerald are superior to that of Campbell, especially that of Fitzgerald, which is all too little known. For an accurate translation Smyth's prose version in the Loeb Classical Library is excellent. The trouble with Campbell's translation is that he has adopted 600 emendations of previous scholars, 200 of his own, and has 30 more in the appendix. Moreover, the translation is often jingling and even trite. Where, however, there is jingling assonance in the Greek, as in *κρατούντων τῶν . . . γνώσει γέρον ὦν*, Campbell (1998-2002) has none and injects modern ideas like that of the bridge.

"What? threats from thee, that pliest the nether oar,
To them that on the bridge control the ship?"

Old as thou art, thou'lt learn how sore a thing
'Tis to be schooled at that indocile age,
When the lesson's in humility."

But Campbell himself modestly says that he is "no great connoisseur of poetry as such" and that his "attempts at restoration may often be wrong." Campbell gives us an interpretation of the work which he translates and that according to Mackail is what a translation provides. For example, in lines 64 ff. we have

"Like brood-robbed eagles barking war
They flew, like eagles hoarse with grief,
Fierce against fox, the murderous thief,
Towering and wheeling wide and far;
Reft of the charge that was their chief
Joy, for the ravaged eyrie sore;
Lone sky-borne boats on pinion'd oar.
But One above there is that hears
Even the inarticulate creature's tears;
Pan, Zeus, Apollo—Heaven has ears,
And at the dark transgressor's door
Lays vengeance late, but swoll'n fourscore—
Ay, though it take ten years!"

This is a good example of Campbell's verses and it is interesting that he translates *αἰγυπῶν* as eagles, not vultures. Vultures do not dash upon smaller birds and men are not glad at the sport of vultures (*Od.*, XXII, 302 f.), as I know from experiences with them in Asia Minor, where I have never seen a vulture sitting on a tree, as hawks and falcons do. In view of the Vedic *rjipyā*, hawk or falcon is a more likely translation than eagle or vulture. Cf. also Ramsay, *Asian Elements in Greek Civilisation*, pp. 60-61.

There is no asyndeton or strutting or inauguration of awe in the last lines of the Greek which end with an auspicious and euphemistic *καλῶς*.

κόμπασον θαρσῶν, ἀλέκτωρ ὥστε θηλείας πέλας.
μὴ προτιμήσης ματαίων τῶνδ' ὑλαγμάτων· ἐγὼ
καὶ σὺ θήσομεν κρατοῦντε τῶνδε δωμάτων καλῶς.

Cho. Boast, fume, and strut, a cock beside his dame!
Clyt. Heed not that vain and baying pack; our power
Established, I and thou shall rule together,
And of our dynasty yet inaugurate awe.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

GRACE H. MACURDY. *The Quality of Mercy. The Gentler Virtues in Greek Literature.* New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xiii + 185. \$2.00.

This eloquent and substantial volume on a timely and appropriate subject for these dark days of barbarism and inhumanity traces the growth of the humane virtues through the epic, lyric, and tragic poets. It discusses the feeling for humanity in the historians and orators with the summing up of the gentler virtues in Plato's all-embracing idea of justice. Aristotle and the Hellenistic writers are also considered. These ideas, Miss Macurdy says, were adopted by

Christianity and culminated in St. Paul in his praise of love (1 Cor., 13, 1 ff.) and became a part of our Western ideals of mercy, right, and justice,—a rather extravagant statement which does not take into account Christianity's ideas of humility and its positive contributions. But Miss Macurdy certainly proves that the Greeks had virtues which are lacking in some modern nations. The Homeric *aidós*, which does not exist in the Doloneia (a subject which causes a digression on *Iliad*, X), gives way to *σωφροσύνη*. *σώφρων* and *κόσμος* are characteristics of the ideal democratic Athenian. But Miss Macurdy has not used the important monograph by Carl E. von Erffa, *Aidós und verwandte Begriffe in ihrer Entwicklung von Homer bis Demokrit* (*Philologus*, Supplementb. XXX, 2 [1937], pp. 1-206). Hesiod's *díkē* leads to the classical *δικαιοσύνη* and on to the *ἀγάπη* of the New Testament and to Wordsworth's "Ode to Duty." Wordsworth's ode owes much to Aeschylus through Merrick, Gray, and Horace. In this connection such books as Sven Lönborg, *Dike und Eros*, L. Schmidt, *Die Ethik der alten Griechen*, R. J. Bonner and Gertrude Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, B. Daube, *Zu den Rechtsproblemen in Aischylos' Agamemnon*, E. Wolff, *Philanthropie bei den alten Griechen*, H. Bolkestein, *Wohltätigkeit und Armenpflege im vorchristlichen Altertum* might have been read, and it is interesting to find no reference to Shorey in the discussion of Plato (p. 178). Everywhere one feels the influence of Gilbert Murray and of other English scholars such as Burnet, Thomson, Farnell, to the neglect of Americans. For example, the estimate of L. A. Post, who has written many articles about Menander and translated him, is to be preferred to that of Tarn (p. 168) who finds him the "dreariest desert in all literature." Miss Macurdy is naturally partial to Euripides, her first love. She regards his *Electra* as a protest against Sophocles' *Electra*, his *Heracles* as a criticism of the *Oedipus Tyrannus*. She rates the prayer of the *Trojan Women*, a protest against the rape of Melos (884-8), higher than Sophocles' chorus on the Heavenly Laws (*O. T.*, 863 ff.). She even goes so far as to say (p. 137) that Sophocles is "not interested in ideas." Many would find as much religion and as gentle virtues in serious Sophocles as in the realistic melodramatic Euripides. As for Pindar, a reading of Robinson's little book on *Pindar, A Poet of Eternal Ideas* might have discovered more love and pity in Pindar that would have qualified the statement (p. 72) that "his range of thought is too narrow and he is too thoroughly and consciously an aristocrat by birth and intellect to be a great poet." For Solon we need references to Woodhouse, *Solon the Liberator*; for Sappho to Robinson, *Sappho and her Influence*; for Theognis to Highbarger's many articles and his book on *Megara*. We miss references to Jaeger's *Paideia, the Ideals of Greek Culture*, etc. Articles also are sadly neglected, such as that on the famous drinking song about Harmodius and Aristogeiton (*C. W.*, X [1917], pp. 138-42), Professor Gulick's "Notions of Humanity among the Greeks" (*Harvard Essays on Classical Subjects* [1912], pp. 33-65), and Professor Hewitt's many articles on Gratitude (*T. A. P. A.*, XLIII [1912], pp. 95-111; XLV [1914], pp. 77-90; XLVIII [1917], pp. 37-48; LV [1924], pp. 35-51; *C. W.*, XVIII [1924], pp. 148-51; *A. J. P.*, XLIII [1922], pp. 331-43; LII [1931], pp. 30-48).

The reference on p. 78, n. 6 to Murray should be either to *The Athenian Drama*, III or better to *Euripides*, pp. xxiv ff., and the translation (cited from Murray) of Herodotus, III, 8, that "a people does none of these things," omits the word *μόναρχος*. It would be better to add "which the monarch does." On p. 77 is an inadequate translation of Pindar's famous couplet. *λιπαραί* is not "lovely" but shining, referring to the bright sunlight of Athens; *κλειναί* is famous or renowned rather than "splendid"; *δαιμόνιον* is divine rather than "marvelous." There are several errors in the book, which seems to presuppose a wide acquaintance with Greek and Greek problems and yet is meant to be popular and transliterates Greek words even to the extent of using such phrases as (p. 59) "the Moirae are called *Klothes*, Spinners." Would not the average non-Greek reader think of clothes in connection with spinners? One peculiar confusion is Atlanta for Atalanta (p. 76), the reverse of a liberty permitted itself by the University of Oxford in sending Latin felicitations to Emory University, moved in 1919 from Oxford, Georgia, to near Atlanta, for the centennial celebration in 1936, "ut vos Atalantae more scientiae poma amatoribus vestris proiciatis," a pun which introduced to America a new version of the famous footrace.

Despite irrelevancies and certain peculiarities, the book is a charming, scholarly, and interesting reminder that we should still believe in the gentler virtues of humanity, justice, mercy, and pity, in which the Greeks were not so inferior as some have supposed.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

DAVID M. ROBINSON.

A. H. M. JONES. *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian.* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. viii + 393. \$7.00.

Just over a century ago there appeared Otfried Müller's *Antiquitates Antiochenae*, at once a landmark in the history of scholarship and an early token of the importance which attaches to the history of the cities in the study of Greco-Roman civilization. Müller's book was followed by a long and honorable line of monographs, one of the most recent of which is Cadoux's distinguished history of Smyrna. From time to time there have also been written comprehensive studies of city administration, as for example the works of Kuhn, Liebenam, and Abbott and Johnson.

Our evidence for this phase of ancient history has grown so fast, and has become so unwieldy, that it is staggering to think of trying to master all of it, and not many scholars would have the courage or the confidence to set about writing a comprehensive and authoritative, and still readable, treatise on it. This is what Mr. Jones has done. In an earlier volume, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (Oxford, 1937; reviewed in this Journal, LXII [1941], pp. 104-7), he collected and made available the principal material on which a study of city administration may now be based. In this volume he presents, in a series of narrative chapters, an analysis and interpretation of this material.

Jones' theme is "the development of the Greek city under the rule of kings and emperors." He divides his material first according to

topics. The larger sections describe the spread of civic institutions over the Near East; the city's relations with the suzerain; its internal politics; and the civic services. Within each section, chapters treat these topics in the Hellenistic age, under the Roman republic and the empire, and in the Byzantine age. A final section assays the achievement of the cities, economic, political and administrative, and cultural. The text is readable and vigorous. The notes, placed at the end of the volume, serve not only to cite the sources but to accommodate involved or controversial matters which do not belong in the body of the book.

Jones' general policy, he states in his preface, is to cite the original authorities, though he sometimes cites as well modern works which he has found especially useful. "The references are in many cases not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to give typical illustrations. . . . The reader will thus in most cases . . . be able to satisfy himself of the truth of a statement by direct reference to the original documents on which it is based instead of having to consult one or more modern works before getting back to the source of the argument." This is one of the principal points which a book of this kind raises. The charge that can be made against such a work is that it is incomplete and even superficial. On the other hand it is a great thing, in these days of many books, to get all the sources before one in one convenient volume; for, as Jones points out, his method "has the further advantage that it makes plain how slender is the evidence for many modern theories, which often pass untested on the authority of a great name." The choice of this method imposes a burden, for it calls for courage, wisdom, and skill on the part of the author, and for understanding and restraint on the part of the reader. If all these conditions can be fulfilled (and Jones carries out his part of the bargain admirably), then the result is a book which will be able, in spite of its limitations, and if you will deficiencies, to provide something that a work whose chief bulk consisted of bibliography could not give. Any specialist who reads such a book as this will think of things about which he knows more than the author seems to—or at least more than the author has chosen to give. To cite one example, one can learn more than Jones tells us about municipal building officials from W. K. Prentice's article "Officials Charged with the Conduct of Public Works in Roman and Byzantine Syria," *T. A. P. A.*, XLIII (1912), pp. 113-23 and G. M. Harper's study "Village Administration in the Roman Province of Syria" in the *Yale Class. Studies*, I (1928). Yet Jones' treatment of these officials is adequate and the reader will not be misled if he is not, in this place, furnished with the special bibliography of the subject. The thought of that other book that might be (who could write it?) must not be allowed to obscure the fact that this book and its predecessor are the only convenient—and in some cases the only—sources of reference for many of the ancient cities.

When a work possesses the magnitude and importance which Jones' has, it no longer seems impertinent or captious to offer suggestions on a few points on which supplementary information might be given in the future revisions which such a book as this deserves to have. In the present review these suggestions will be

confined to matters which concern the Roman and Byzantine periods. Jones has not given full consideration to the circus factions, the Greens and the Blues, which played such an important part in the political and social life not only of Constantinople but of the provincial cities as well, in the imperial period (cf. pp. 254, 280). The vulgate holds that these were merely sporting organizations; but it has been shown that they were much more than this (see G. Manojlović, "Le peuple de Constantinople," *Byzantion*, XI [1936], pp. 617-716; Y. Janssens, "Les Bleus et les Verts sous Maurice, Phocas et Héraclius," *ibid.*, pp. 499-536; G. I. Bratianu, "Empire et 'démocratie' à Byzance," *Byz. Ztschr.*, XXXVII [1937], pp. 86-111). The factions represented the political parties of the time, and their voice throughout the eastern empire was much more powerful than one might think possible under a despotic government. The division was not merely political but was social and administrative, since it could be carried down into the location and demarcation of the quarters which the parties inhabited in Constantinople and the provincial cities. Moreover, the factions were organized as local militia and as such played a major part in the defense of the cities. They also embodied the rivalries of the religious sects, which were as much expressions of nationalism and social conflict as they were of theological disagreement. There was naturally a good bit of urban patriotism, and one of the few channels through which this could find expression was that of religious partisanship (see, for example, E. L. Woodward, *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire* [London, 1916]).

Another addition which the reviewer would make to the book would be a discussion of the official records which the cities kept of their histories, the *acta urbis*, and the local annals which were from time to time compiled and published. One misses, too, an adequate discussion of the social and political position of the Jews in the cities of the empire. The importance of the question of their status in the administration of the cities is exemplified in C. H. Kraeling's article "The Jewish Community at Antioch," *Journ. of Bibl. Lit.*, LI (1932), pp. 130-60.

Any government looks bad on paper. The Hellenistic governments and even more so the Roman administration look astonishingly bad. Here, however, we must remember that we have often precious little paper to look at. Moreover, a bad government will work, sometimes quite well, if its people want it to work. Herein may lie some of the reasons why the Roman government, in spite of crises and breakdowns, managed to last as long as it did, and, if it lasted as long as it did in the east, while it fell so comparatively quickly and easily in the west, part of the answer, perhaps a considerable part, must lie in the temper of the people. If one sometimes feels that the evidence that we do have gives precisely the wrong side of the picture (even though Jones marshals it with consummate skill), and if one moves through the depressing record with an air of unreality, it must be remembered that there is another side of the picture, disconcertingly different and often baffling, which Jones cannot give us in this book. Counterweights there must have been, and these must be sought elsewhere. Some of them, or hints of them, are to be found in the mosaics of Antioch on the Orontes

and of Philippopolis in the Jebel Druze, in Synesius and Libanius and in Plotinus, and in the architecture of the "dead cities" of Syria. To seek the meaning of all these things must be the task of others, and for them Jones has gathered rich material. Perhaps a part of the reason why the tale of the late Roman government sometimes seems so unreal, and so singularly dreary, is that we have as yet no full-scale social and economic history in the light of which we may read Jones' narrative.

This book and its predecessor together form a monument of which any scholar might well be proud. They will be welcomed by all students who deal with such subjects, and especially by those who know from their own experience how extraordinarily difficult the author's task was.

GLANVILLE DOWNEY.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

-
- T. Macci Plauti Epidicus. Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary, in which is included the work of the late Arthur L. Wheeler, by GEORGE E. DUCKWORTH. Princeton Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xi + 464; 4 pls. \$7.50.

Good news is in great demand nowadays, and the publication of this volume would be excellent news at any time. It is, I believe, the first edition of a Greek or Latin play with complete critical apparatus and full exegetical commentary for the use of scholars, to be produced by an American. It sets a very high standard for future editors.

The editor had the advantage of using Professor A. L. Wheeler's notes on about 200 lines of the text and occasionally quotes from these notes in his commentary. Wheeler had also procured in 1930 complete photographic reproductions of the text of the *Epidicus* in manuscripts B, E, V, and J, which enabled Duckworth to make a complete collation of these four MSS. He depends on Studemund for the readings of A, and, when he thinks it worth while to mention those of F and Z, quotes them from Goetz's second edition. For the commentary he found some useful material in the editions of Ussing, Gray, and Ammendola, "but both Gray and Ussing are sadly out of date, and Gray and Ammendola are school editions" (p. ix). Wheeler and Duckworth were correct in their belief that a new critical edition and a new commentary to this rather "different" play were needed.

The short preface (pp. vii-ix) is followed by the text (pp. 3-89) with critical apparatus, which "contains full information concerning the text of A, all the variant readings of BEVJ, and the authority for departures from the reading of the manuscripts; other emendations and suggestions are relegated to the commentary" (p. viii). Duckworth's editing is conservative; he belongs to the modern school of editors who show more interest in understanding the text handed down to them than in altering it. He accepts emendations when they are clearly needed; I have found only one of his own in the text (560: *voltus turbatur tuos*; a good solution of the difficulty). He is not hasty in assuming the activity of that

somewhat outmoded villain, the *retractator*; he brackets very few lines, and only where there is really troublesome and awkward repetition.

The commentary, covering pp. 93-414 (322 pages on 733 lines), deals most impartially and completely with all the different types of problems which the play involves: textual, linguistic, metrical, historical, and those concerned with the plot and structure of the play, and its relation to the Greek original. The plot is a very complicated one, and the lack of a Plautine prologue (probably lost; cf. the commentary, pp. 97-8, 154, 207-8) makes it somewhat obscure without careful study. Various "difficulties" and "inconsistencies" have been noted and extensively discussed by scholars. In the twentieth century these discussions have moved away from theories of *contaminatio* and *retractatio* and centered largely about the speculations in regard to the nature of the Greek original made by Dziatzko (*Rh. Mus.*, LV [1900], pp. 104-10), Fraenkel, and Jachmann, among others; and most recently and exhaustively by W. E. J. Kuiper (*Het Origineel van Plautus' Epidicus* [Amsterdam, 1938]). The last-mentioned scholar believes that he can restore in full detail from the Latin plays the plot and structure of their Greek models, but his reconstructions have been considered by most of his reviewers as on the whole more imaginative than cogent, though containing many valuable analyses and ideas. Duckworth has previously given briefly in his review (*Class. Phil.*, XXXV [1940], pp. 86-90) his opinions of the various elements in Kuiper's attempted reconstruction of the original of this play, and he discusses them more fully in his commentary. He shows good judgment in rejecting 1) Kuiper's strange theory that Epidicus deceived and intended to continue to deceive the youth Stratippocles (as well as his father Periphanes) into believing that Acropolistis the harp-girl was his half-sister, 2) his belief that two different *militēs gloriosi*, a Euboean and a Rhodian, appeared on the stage in the Greek play, and 3) his unnecessary and complicated theory about the use of a "check" instead of cash in the fake purchase of the hired harp-girl. He is doubtful with good reason about the existence in the Greek original of the delayed prologue spoken by a god which Kuiper invariably introduces into his reconstructions—though there must have been more exposition *somewhere* in the early part of the original than is now found in the Latin play.

Duckworth accepts, in common with the great majority of scholars, the theory, originating with Dziatzko, that in the Greek original Stratippocles married his half-sister Telestis. Since I have already published an article (*T. A. P. A.*, LXXI [1940], pp. 217-29) in which I attempt to show that there is no evidence at all for the marriage of ἀδελφοὶ ὁμοπάτριοι in New Comedy—a favorite type of dénouement in Kuiper's reconstructions—I shall not discuss the matter further here.

The commentary is followed by a metrical analysis of the play, four plates which show lines 47 ff. as they appear in the MSS BEVJ, a list of abbreviations, a thirteen-page Plautine bibliography, and an index to the commentary. The up-to-date bibliography will be most helpful; it can be used advantageously in connection with

Enk's comprehensive bibliographies of Plautus in his *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde* (II, 1 and 2 [Zutphen, 1937]).

Some readers would have expected Duckworth to preface his text with a general introduction to the play and the complicated problems connected with it, and he may receive some adverse criticism for not having done so. He has preferred to put all this prefatory material into the commentary, which contains short introductions to all the scenes of the play. He asks his readers to go through the play with him; they should withhold their criticism until they have done so. They will find all the information in the notes, and with no more repetition than would have resulted from the more usual arrangement. Those interested in special topics will find the Index to the commentary useful.

The *Epidicus* is a lively play with a rather original plot. It is to be hoped that this edition will encourage its reading in graduate courses, and even with college upper-classmen who are majoring in the Classics; and that Professor Duckworth will be able to publish similar editions of some of the other less commonly edited Plautine plays.

The volume is most accurately and beautifully printed in large, clear type. Classical scholars can be grateful to Mrs. A. L. Wheeler, the Princeton University Press, the Dean West Classical Foundation, and the Princeton University Research Fund, as well as to the editor, for making its production possible.

CLINTON W. KEYES.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

Livy, Vol. VI (Books XXIII-XXV). With an English Translation by FRANK GARDNER MOORE. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press; London, William Heinemann, 1940. Pp. x + 519; 5 maps. (*Loeb Classical Library*.)

With this translation the Loeb Livy has reached the tenth of thirteen volumes, leaving VII, VIII, and XIII to bring it to completion. Professor Moore, the fourth to share in the task, has produced a translation which is, for the most part, good and readable. It preserves the rapidity, if not always the grace and richness of the original. "And herein Livie of all other in any tounge, by myne opinion, carrieth away the prayse."

Horace laid down the principle:

nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus
interpret;

and St. Jerome, quoting him with approval, added: si ad verbum interpretor, absurde resonant. In certain passages this seems to be the case with the present translation: there are some awkward and stilted sentences (one on p. 119 lacks a verb); a too frequent use of the English to translate the Latin participle; a continual use of the words "and," "for" to begin a sentence (on p. 443 five sentences begin with "and"); Kalends appears on p. 113 but the date on p. 383 is after the modern reckoning; conscript fathers

(p. 359) is not a translation and conveys little, if any, meaning to an English reader.

The limited space available for notes in the series has been well used. An excellent appendix on Syracuse, which shows, as does the translation of the passages on the siege of the city, a personal acquaintance with the place; a good index; maps of southern Italy, Sicily, and Spain; plans of Syracuse and Tarentum, complete this useful volume.

D. O. ROBSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO.

EDGAR H. STURTEVANT. *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin*. Second Edition. Baltimore, 1940. Pp. 192. (*William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series*, published for Yale University by the Linguistic Society of America, Philadelphia [removed 1941 to Iowa City].)

The standard work on the pronunciation of Greek was for many years Blass' volume, *Ueber die Aussprache des Griechischen* (Berlin), the third edition appearing in 1888; the corresponding volume for Latin was Seelmann, *Die Aussprache des Latein* (Heilbronn), which came out in 1885. Both these were supplanted in 1920 by the first edition of Sturtevant's *The Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* (Chicago), which went out of print some years ago. The present second edition of this invaluable work is thoroughly revised and much enlarged, with complete utilization of the recent literature. It will be the standard, indispensable work on the subject for years to come.

There are not many major points on which Sturtevant has changed his views. The most important is that he now regards the Greek voiced mutes β , δ , γ as voiced aspirates in the classical period, changing to voiced spirants in Hellenistic (§ 90b, § 94, § 95, § 97); but the evidence for aspiration seems to me to be very slight and unconvincing. Further, the summary (§ 97) on the pronunciation of the mutes disregards the quite certain variation of κ , γ , χ between velar and palatal varieties in accord with the nature of the vowel which followed. The citation of abnormal orthographies without the equivalents in normal spellings makes at times (e.g., in § 52) a considerable difficulty in following the argument; not all users of the book can be expected to appreciate the rarer words thus disguised. In fact, there are many paragraphs which will be rather puzzling to teachers who ought to have this book, and use it, if they have only a scant command of phonetic and linguistic terminology; but perhaps I am afflicted with an unwarranted eagerness for speaking in simple terms.

My major dissent is still that on the nature of the accent of Latin, inasmuch as I continue to follow Abbott's view presented in *Class. Phil.*, II (1907), pp. 444-60: that the Greek teachers who came to Rome in the second century B. C., and later, infected their students with the practice of speaking Latin with an accent which was essentially one of musical pitch, while other persons continued to

use the older Latin accent characterized by greater energy of articulation—a social difference of dialect which disappeared by 300 A. D., when the accent of energy again became universal; see my *Sounds of Latin*, § 66 and note 2, for literature and details. It is only thus that one can explain the phenomena of the language which are produced by a stress accent and also the statements of the Latin grammarians that Latin had a pitch accent like that of Greek; and can explain also the apparent conflict of word accent and of metrical accent in Latin verse, the solution here being that in verse the word accent was (as in the speech of cultivated Romans) an accent of higher musical note, and the metrical accent was one of greater energy. Sturtevant had no allusion to this theory in his first edition, when Abbott's article had appeared but mine had not; in this second edition he rejects it on grounds enumerated in § 213, which fail, however, to convince me.

Now a series of small points. P. 19: it is confusing to transliterate Greek inscriptional H, where it has the value of [h], by the letter η; the customary practice is to use h. § 5a: "Varro allowed theoretic considerations to convince him that h was not a letter!" it should be explained that Varro always says *littera* when he means "sound," and never uses *sonus* in the meaning "sound." § 33: the attitude that the first vowel of Eng. *vacation* represents approximately the sound of Greek ε and of French é does not agree with my appreciation of the normal pronunciation of *vacation*. § 35: the Old Persian proper names which he cites as *Kambujiya*, *Huvaxštra*, *Vištāspa*, are respectively, in the Old Persian orthography, to be normalized as *Kabūjiya* (the *m* is not written), *Uvaxštra* (the *h* is not written), *Vištāspa* (the long vowel is definitely indicated in the writing); these errors are in the first edition also, p. 133. § 54b: τὰϋρος should be ταϋρος; and note 51 is in error, since a semivocalic glide may precede as well as follow a *u*-sound. § 85, on the origin of certain voiceless semivowels, liquids, nasals, from clusters containing a laryngeal consonant, is new material, and may well be the solution of this puzzling problem. § 89: in giving the value of Greek σ Sturtevant identifies English, French, German *s*; but *s* is alveolar in English and German, and dental in French. The same inaccuracy is found when equivalents for Latin *s* are given, § 187.

Now a few items from the chapters on Latin. § 120: Sturtevant speaks of "the change of originally unaccented *a* and *o* to *e* in closed syllables"; but *o* changed to *e* only in medial open syllables and when absolutely final. § 126-§ 126d: Sturtevant gives no satisfactory interpretation of the vowel variation *maximus* / *maxumus*. § 139: he lists *neutiquam* among the words containing the diphthong *eu*, although metrical evidence shows that this was *ne + utiquam*, with elision, giving *nūtiquam*. § 145: he fails to list, among the exceptional diphthongs arising by contraction, *ou* in *prout*, Horace, *Sat.*, II, 6, 67. § 193c: he regards the failure of *m* to become [ŋ] before *qu*, while it does make the change before *c*, as indicating a labial affection of the *q* from the beginning of the articulation; but all the examples (as in *quamquam*, *quicumque*) can be explained as the result of recomposition. Against his view is also the fact that **kom + voveō* became *convoveō*; and this change, even should

it be by analogical extension, indicates that the labial element could hardly be strong enough in *qu* to require the retention of *m*. P. 192, addendum to § 178b: he states that *gm* was not [ɣm] because *e* remains unchanged in *segmen*, *tegmen*, whereas *e* regularly became *i* before [ɣ]; but these words have late *gm*, developed by syncope, cf. *tegimen*(*tum*), *tegumen*(*tum*), and may have kept the *e* by the influence of *secō* and *tegō*.

These are minor points, however, and I heartily commend Sturtevant's *Pronunciation of Greek and Latin* to every person who is interested in knowing how the ancient Greeks and Romans spoke Greek and Latin. For we do know, within very narrow limits of error, how they spoke; and I am confident that any modern who spoke Attic Greek according to the tenets set forth in this volume would be understood by Xenophon and Euripides, and anyone who spoke Latin in this way would be understood by Caesar and Cicero: only he would have to follow these tenets with accuracy (unlike most classicists of my acquaintance), and of course he would still be recognized as a foreigner. But what a thrill it would give both parties to the conversation!

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

JAMES MORTON PATON, editor. *The Venetians in Athens 1687-1688. From the Istoria of Cristoforo Ivanovich.* Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xiv + 104. (*Gennadeion Monographs*, I.)

The *Gennadeion Monographs* published for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens are to be devoted to source material in the Gennadeion Library at Athens and to general studies in related fields. Most volumes in the series will therefore probably be concerned with problems in Byzantine, mediaeval, and modern times. This first volume does not present material from the Gennadeion Library, but extracts from a manuscript in the Harvard College Library, the *Istoria della Lega Ortodossa contra il Turco*, by Cristoforo Ivanovich, Canon of San Marco. A few sentences therein are sure to interest all lovers of Greek antiquities. "Avvertito Sua Eccellenza [Francesco Morosini] trovarsi nel Tempio di Minerva le monizioni de' Turchi insieme con le loro principali donne e figli, stimandosi ivi sicuri per la grossezza delle mura e volti del detto tempio, ordinò al Conte Mutoni che dirizzasse il tiro delle sue bombe a quella parte." After some technical details about how the gunners overcame the difficulties of hitting their target, the author concludes "... restando in questo modo rovinato quel famoso Tempio di Minerva, che tanti secoli e tante guerre non aveano potuto distruggere."

That Morosini himself gave the order to direct fire on the Parthenon is not corroborated by other accounts and, as the editor says, "may have no better authority than the wish to magnify the importance of the Captain General." Ivanovich's narrative as a whole, although not this detail, is based largely on the *Avvisi* or official

communiqués issued by the Venetian Inquisitori di Stato. In calling attention in the notes to the many cases where Ivanovich's version of events differs from other accounts, such as Morosini's own reports, the editor generally concedes the greater accuracy of other sources. He claims for the *Istoria* only that it "may well present a fairly complete and accurate picture of the course of events as seen by an intelligent Venetian in the somewhat uncertain light of official statements."

The notes and the four appendices show an extensive use of Italian archival materials. The new sources most fruitfully tapped by Professor Paton are the reports sent from Venice by agents of the Grand Duke of Tuscany. They touch on many details of the war and furnish valuable light on political rivalries in Venice.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

FREDERIC C. LANE.

THOMAS A. KELLY. *Sancti Ambrosii Liber de Consolatione Valentiniani*. A Text with a Translation, Introduction and Commentary. Washington, D. C., Catholic Univ. of America, 1940. Pp. xxi + 324. (*Patristic Studies*, LVIII.)

This dissertation is a welcome addition to the literature concerned with St. Ambrose, who has been called by De Ghellinck ". . . le père de l'hymnologie latine du peuple chrétien." Dr. Kelly has published this short text of the *Consolatio*, with an excellent translation (the first complete translation into English to this reviewer's knowledge), preceded by an introduction which deals with the historical value of the work, as well as grammatical analyses and a study of its prose rhythm. A lengthy commentary follows the text and translation.

This touching funeral sermon on the death of Valentinian was delivered by the Bishop of Milan in 392. It is written in a beautiful, rhythmic prose and is an excellent example of the literature of transition, in which the rhetorical style of the ancients is sweetened by the gentle spirit of early Christianity. Dr. Kelly is to be congratulated on his success in transferring this spirit into English.

The footnotes to the Introduction are occasionally superfluous, since they often deal with self-evident or non-controversial material, such as, for example, notes 39 and 40 on page 21. Although Dr. Kelly's treatment of Ambrose's language is fairly complete, it is to be regretted that he neglected to compare it more fully with other works by the same author, in order to determine its relationship to what the late Mgr. Schrijnen called "le latin chrétien," Vulgar Latin, and the work of contemporaries such as Ambrose's disciple St. Augustine, certain portions of whose work were intentionally vulgarized. In this connection see the latter's *Retractationes*, I, 19. Marron's superb *St. Augustin et la fin de la culture antique* (Paris, 1938), should have been included in the general bibliography.

LOUIS FURMAN SAS.

COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

ERWIN R. GOODENOUGH. *An Introduction to Philo Judaeus*. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1940. Pp. xii + 223. \$2.75.

Both the specialist and the beginner owe Professor Goodenough a debt of gratitude for this very valuable Introduction to Philo. It is easily the best book to place in the hands of the student and at the same time it affords the specialist the best balanced view of Goodenough's own studies which have contributed so much to a reappraisal of Philo's significance for the history of religion.

Anyone competent to write an introduction has already arrived at certain conclusions. It is a disservice to the reader to pretend otherwise. The test of a good introduction is whether the author deals fairly with his materials, revealing both the objections to his thesis raised by competent scholars and the extent to which the thesis is unsupported, as yet, by evidence. Judged by these standards Goodenough has produced a model introduction. His own thesis, i. e. that Philo is the key to an understanding of Hellenistic philosophy which serves as the bridge between normative Judaism and Hellenistic Christianity, is clearly stated in the preface and is apparent throughout the book. This thesis is not unduly pressed, however, and the author not only acknowledges the limitations of his own competence, e. g. in the field of halachic studies, but also states the task awaiting the investigation of the scholar.

Beginning with a chapter on Method, the author deals in successive chapters with Philo's Writings, the Political Thinker, the Jew, the Philosopher: Metaphysics, the Philosopher: Man and Ethics, and the Mystic, followed by a biographical note and index. Goodenough's special contributions are to be found, in summary form, in the chapters on the Political Thinker and the Mystic, but the other chapters are hardly less illuminating. To cite but one example, no student of Paul can afford to miss the discussion of Philo's conception of man on p. 152 and following.

While this reviewer happens to share Goodenough's thesis at least to the extent of regarding it as the most useful hypothesis for further studies, he believes that the introduction will prove equally useful to those who dissent. Philo can no longer be regarded as an isolated, if intriguing, figure in the history of religious thought. All serious students must accept the challenge to integrate Philo in the total picture. This, again, is the service a good introduction should render.

One cannot refrain from comment on the clarity and vigor of the author's style as well as the sense of interest and even excitement he communicates to the reader. The dedication to the staff of The Jewish Theological Seminary of America is not only a graceful gesture but in keeping with the finest tradition of scholarship and worth noting in such a time as our own.

ALEXANDER C. PURDY.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

(It is impossible to review all books submitted to the JOURNAL, but all are listed under BOOKS RECEIVED. Contributions sent for review or notice are not returnable.)

Bloch (Bernard) and Trager (George L.). *Outline of Linguistic Analysis*. Baltimore, *Linguistic Society of America*, 1942. Pp. 82.

Bloomfield (Leonard). *Outline Guide for the Practical Study of Foreign Languages*. Baltimore, *Linguistic Society of America*, 1942. Pp. 16.

Duckworth (George E.). *The Complete Roman Drama*. All the extant comedies of Plautus and Terence, and the tragedies of Seneca, in a variety of translations. Edited, and with an introduction. New York, *Random House*, 1942. 2 vols. Pp. xlv + 905; 971. \$6.00.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, LIII. Cambridge, *Harvard Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. 184.

Howard (Leon). *The Connecticut Wits*. Chicago, *Univ. of Chicago Press*, 1943. Pp. xiii + 453. \$4.50.

Lindner (Gladys Dudley). *Marcel Proust. Reviews and Estimates in English*. Stanford University, *Stanford Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. xviii + 314. \$3.50.

McGeachy (John Alexander, Jr.). *Quintus Aurelius Symmachus and the Senatorial Aristocracy of the West*. Chicago, Private ed. distributed by the Univ. of Chicago Libraries, 1942. Pp. iii + 203. (Diss.)

Minar (Edwin L.). *Early Pythagorean Politics in Practice and Theory*. Baltimore, *Waverly Press*, 1942. Pp. ix + 143. \$2.00. (To be ordered from Connecticut College Bookshop, New London, Conn.) (*Connecticut College Monograph*, No. 2.)

Nyikos (Lajos). *Athenaeus quo consilio quibusque usus subsidiis Dipnosophistarum libros composuerit*. Basel, *Friedrich Reinhardt*, 1941. Pp. 117.

Ringler (William). *Stephen Gosson. A Biographical and Critical Study*. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. viii + 151. \$2.00. (*Princeton Studies in English*, XXV.)

Rose (H. J.). *The Eclogues of Vergil*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, *Univ. of California Press*, 1942. Pp. ix + 276. \$2.50. (*Sather Classical Lectures*, XVI.)

Schlöpfer (P. Lothar). *Untersuchungen zu den Attischen Staatsurkunden und den Amphiktyonenbeschlüssen der Demosthenischen Kranzrede*. Paderborn, *Ferdinand Schöningh*, 1939. Pp. 246. (*Rhetorische Studien*, Heft XXI.)

Singer, Edgar Arthur, Jr.: *Philosophical Essays in honor of*. Edited by F. P. Clarke and M. C. Nahm. Philadelphia, *Univ. of Pennsylvania Press*; London, *Humphrey Milford*, *Oxford Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. x + 377. \$3.50.

Stirling (Matthew W.). *Origin Myth of Acoma and Other Records*. Washington, D. C., *U. S. Gov't. Printing Office*, 1942. Pp. viii + 123; 17 plates; 8 text figs. (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bull. 135.)

Stork (Charles Wharton). *Anthology of Norwegian Lyrics*. Translated in the Original Meters, with an Introduction by C. J. Hambro. Princeton, *Princeton Univ. Press*; *American-Scandinavian Foundation*, 1942. Pp. xxxvi + 153. \$2.75.

Swanton (John R.). *Source Material on the History and Ethnology of the Caddo Indians*. Washington, D. C., *U. S. Gov't. Printing Office*, 1942. Pp. vii + 332; 19 plates; 5 text figs. (*Smithsonian Institution, Bureau of American Ethnology*, Bull. 132.)

Webster (T. B. L.). *Greek Interpretations*. *Manchester Univ. Press*, 1942. Pp. viii + 128. 5 s.

Yutang (Lin). *The Wisdom of China and India. An Anthology*. New York, *Random House*, 1942. Pp. xiii + 1104. \$3.95.